

THE GERMANS AND THE JEWS

F. R. BIENENFELD

SECKER & Warburg

Twenty Two Essex Street Strand W.C. 2

MARTIN SECKER AND Warburg LTD
22 ESSEX STREET, LONDON, W.C. 2

First Published 1939

PRINTED IN GUERNSEY, C.I., BRITISH
ISLES, BY THE STAR AND GAZETTE LTD.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	vii
1. CAUSES OF JEWISH ECONOMIC POWER	3
2. PECULIARITIES OF THE ANTI-JEWISH CAMPAIGN IN GERMANY	22
3. THE NEW GERMAN FAITH	39
4. THE GERMAN NATION AND THE JEWISH RACE	65
5. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN COMMUNITIES	104
6. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF THE GERMAN JEWS	126
7. THE GERMAN MENTALITY	185
8. THE CONSEQUENCES	234

FOREWORD

to the English Translation

The value of a book should be obvious from its contents. An explanatory introduction is therefore always an excuse and an unconscious condemnation of the book by the author himself. This, however, does not hold for a translation. In this case the introduction must give the reason why a German book which appeared some time ago may be of interest to foreign readers.

If the only profit to the reader were a knowledge of the German measures against the Jews the book would not be of any importance for him. Day by day the world is flooded with protestations from both parties and, as human sympathy and pity have limits, the reactions of most people have been blunted by the intensity, brutality and duration of the persecution. But the causes and the consequences of the events in Germany have a wider universal significance. It is not merely the conflict between Germans and Jews which is dealt with here, but the meaning of that conflict for every Englishman, every Frenchman and every human being.

According to the National-Socialist view, the German-Jewish conflict is not an incidental struggle between any two communities, not an opposition comparable with the antagonism between Poles and Russians, Czechs and Hungarians, Frenchmen and Italians, which flames up one day and dies out the next, but the decisive battle between eternal and fundamentally irreconcilable ideas. According to this view the war against Judaism is a matter of the greatest importance to humanity and one in which sides must be taken, since no one can stand aloof.

All German measures since 1933 proclaim more and more

clearly the German belief that the real, the only enemy of National-Socialism is the Jewish spirit, the total annihilation of which alone can ensure eternal life to the German ideas. For even now, after six years of fantastic triumph, and successes which have incorporated into the Reich 10,000,000 Germans (however reluctant some have been), have made Central Europe their apparently permanent domain and the Jews of this area refugees or beggars, the hatred of the Jews is still not only the heart and soul of the National-Socialist doctrine, but the core of every single speech of the Führer and his lieutenants—to such an extent indeed that Hitler in a recent important speech could characterise the complete expulsion of the Jews from Europe as the chief aim of the next war. How incomprehensible, indeed how absurd, this would be, if numbers alone and not ideas were decisive. Since 1933 200,000 Jews have left Germany, a further 90,000 Austria since 1938, and hence 80,000,000 Germans stand united against a remnant of 500,000 Jews without any influence whatsoever. Hence the steadily increasing intensity of the persecution would be utterly senseless even from the standpoint of the German government if it were not for the profound conviction that a permanent victory can only be assured by the complete extermination of the Jews and the Jewish spirit.

Every form of Fascism shares this belief. Mussolini's government, behind which, according to his own statement, 44,000,000 Italians stand, considers the same radical measures of physical annihilation as necessary against 60,000 Italian Jews—while maintaining that they are not imitators of Germany. The dissolution of Judaism in Russia is proceeding more unobtrusively but none the less drastically. In all Eastern countries of Europe every state is the more hostile to the Jews the more its programme is based on the principles of autocracy. It is clear that it is the unshakable belief of all authoritarian powers that the slightest trace of Jewish spirit would transform the eternal temple they are erecting into a mundane and temporary structure.

As it is highly improbable that the trifling number of European Jews can be the sole enemy of all forms of Fascism, brown, red or black, it appears likely that the general hostility to the Jews is only

being used in order to glorify certain ideas as German and anti-Jewish and to denounce the contrary democratic ideas as Jewish. Hence the repeated attempts of the German press to represent democratic statesmen, regardless of the facts, either as Jews as in the case of Roosevelt, or as under Jewish influence as in that of Duff Cooper.

Truth, justice and liberty constitute the foundation of democratic countries, not in the sense that these principles have been realised in them, but that, although never attainable, they are nevertheless held to be worth striving for. In Germany, on the other hand, where these principles have been rejected in favour of an heroic ideal, they are identified with the Jewish spirit. Any account of the war against the Jews has no other value than that of revealing how in Germany the glorification of force has taken the place of the pursuit of justice, how the sanctity of a leadership above criticism has displaced the desire for liberty, and how the scorning of truth, the belief in the power of the successful lie, has become a dominant principle. It is not the Jews, it is democratic principles, it is truth, liberty, and justice, which are decried as Jewish conceptions, against which rise the ideas of the new Germany, first directed against the Jews, then against Austria and Czecho-Slovakia, and now on the way to erect a world domination on the ruins of all free countries.

Since the appearance of this book the German government has publicly demonstrated how little it believes itself in the German gospel of race by signing the anti-Comintern pact with the Mongolian Japanese and by supporting the Semitical Arabs. But the very fact that in Germany a faith is active which everyone pretends to believe and no one believes, that effectiveness and truth are separated by a gulf within the modern German soul, this very fact makes an account of this faith, which is still unknown abroad, a scientific and political necessity.

A German scholar of my acquaintance, clever enough to recognise that the German doctrine of race is nonsense, said in answer to my question how he could still continue lecturing on it: "What difference does it make that it is not true if it is effective?" As long as foreign nations do not understand that, for the Germans, truth and

falsehood are only practical aids for the achievement of irrational aims and have no absolute value in themselves, that every treaty, every solemn declaration becomes invalid if mystical aims and the boundless will to power makes this necessary, German policy will always remain a mystery, especially for the Western nations.

But it is not only the aims of German policy—the adoration of force, the sacred egoism of the welfare of the nation at the cost of all other nations and the uncritical veneration of a god-sent Führer—which first became visible in the persecution of the Jews, but which have since been revealed in the treatment of all weaker communities: it is above all the new methods of achieving them as applied against the Jews which are so highly instructive. What is remarkable in German policy, what makes it for other nations so incomprehensible and difficult to combat, is that it makes use of the language of democracy in order to put forward undemocratic demands. In its foreign policy it appears as the champion of freedom and justice—of that freedom which in its home policy has become a term of contempt and of that justice which otherwise is only identified with the welfare of the German nation. Germany never declares openly that it recognises force as the supreme arbiter. Austria was invaded on the grounds that the unification of all Germans was a democratic necessity; Czecho-Slovakia incorporated into the Reich because the liberty of the Slovaks was threatened. Colonies are demanded because the right to live of the German nation makes them indispensable. In every case the phraseology of democracy is employed to further autocratic ends. It is these tactics which render the task of defence so difficult for the Western nations. It is not easy for them to resist the democratic ideas of national unity, of the right to live, of colonial equality, and to fight battles in which the opponent claims to fight under their own democratic slogans. This technique of establishing an empire of naked force under the cloak of the realisation of humanitarian ideals, this democratic language of German foreign policy employed for the purpose of justifying authoritarian deeds showed itself for the first time and in its clearest form in the outlawing of the Jews and was the model for the policy against other nations, to such an extent that against

the latter the same language and the same tactics are used, down to the last detail, as were introduced there for the first time.

The tactics which Germany has adopted towards the Jews are no longer those of the mediaeval pogroms, of illegal murdering and plundering, comprehensible, if not excusable, as sudden outbursts of hate and prejudice. But first it is made clear to the German people that the Jew is the attacker and that the peace-loving German government is only defending itself. Whereupon no illegal spoliation takes place, but the law, justice itself, organises robbery, deliberately and cold-bloodedly. In one case it is called an emigration tax as a punishment imposed on those who voluntarily leave the country after they have been given strict orders to do so by the authorities. In another it is a retribution payment because justice demands that the whole community should be responsible for the act of a seventeen-year-old youth. The welfare of the State demands that Jewish doctors should be refused the right to practise and at the same time prohibits them from leaving the country as they will be needed in the next war. No murder ever takes place in the concentration camps, but people are shot as a legal measure against possible attempts to escape. The property of the Jew is not confiscated, but under threat of immediate imprisonment he is compelled to sign an agreement by which he sells it voluntarily for one-hundredth part of its value. Indeed even the fact that this same property is sold on the same day to an Aryan at its full value and that the Aryan has to pay two-thirds of the difference to the German State as an Aryanisation tax is given a legal justification. For as Jewish property, in consequence of the inability of the Jews to administer it, is worthless but becomes valuable once more in consequence of the organisation of the German State when it passes into Aryan hands, it is only a matter of justice that this increase in the value should be made good to the German State by a tax to the amount of two-thirds of its real value.

It is this technique of using justice to serve the ends of force which makes the Jewish persecution so instructive for all other countries because, first tried out against the Jews, it is now applied in every detail against all weaker nations. It is not the case that Germany

marched into Czecho-Slovakia by force and without any justification; no, the disarmed Czechs gave provocation and had then voluntarily and gratefully to place themselves under German protection—gently influenced perhaps by the threat to bombard Prague. Austria was not occupied by an act of violence, but German freedom had to be preserved against the tyranny of Schuschnigg. As Rumania is threatened by the Western Powers, Germany is prepared to guarantee its frontiers against these violent democracies if it places itself under German protectorate. As Danzig was suffering and the Poles for some mysterious reason demonstrate against the Germans it would be an obvious injustice to keep the treaties with Poland, so that the ten-years' treaty guaranteeing the inviolability of the Corridor and of Danzig has merely been broken by Poland and is invalid. As German rearmament alone guaranteed the freedom of the nations and colonies are essential to it, disarmament can only be discussed after their return, though disarmament even then will be impossible before the destruction of the Maginot Line, built as it clearly was, for offensive purposes.

To describe this method of supplying a democratic reason for authoritarian aims it was not necessary to cite—instead of the comparatively mild examples given in this book which only covers the period to 1935—the much more extreme examples available by the end of 1938, because the general line of development and the justification for the same have remained unaltered and everyone can understand the later examples from the spirit of the former. This book is not a history but an investigation into German belief and the German spirit.

But what is really the aim of this German faith or—what is at present the same—of German policy? German rearmament supplies the answer. It has long ceased to be a means for the German government and has become an end in itself. If it were to stop the result would be unemployment on an unprecedented scale, as more than half of the nation is engaged in it, and despair, poverty and the collapse of the present system. But rearmament without limitation means nothing else than that life is the servant of death. And this aim of death does in fact dominate German life. There is no longer

any individuality but an organised silent mass; no free thought but established formulae; no leisure to enjoy life but a continuous and tense movement towards an unknown heroic catastrophe. No joy through strength but strength through organised joy. Science, art and marriage no longer exist for the sake of truth, liberty and love, but as the controlled means to a tyranny whose aim is simply tyranny itself. What a heavy, monotonous theatricality, what gloomy seriousness, what a liking for torture and being tortured, what a dearth of laughter! This country in which the Minister for Propaganda must organise competitions to show that jokes still exist, is obliged to exclude everything which as a sign of individual life might disturb the solemn attitude of a community ready for death.

And curiously enough the attitude of the Germans to the Jewish spirit is even in this point instructive. For the Jew is for the present German government the symbol of the unorganised individual, the alien for whom the fanaticism of blood is nothing compared with the adventures of the spirit, for whom the glory of death means nothing compared with abundant life and who though tortured and almost wounded unto death does not cease to rise above himself and his own fate with a joke. What a remarkable community which can make a joke like the one in which a Jew when asked how he could marry seeing he had nothing in the world replied: "What do you mean have nothing in the world? I have a provisional visa for Belgium valid for eight days." To the German with his predominance of armaments over economics, of glory over love, of death over life, the Jew appears as the antagonist of the German soul and German aim.

As far as the democracies are concerned, it is not a life and death struggle, it is a struggle between life and death.

THE GERMANS AND THE JEWS

CHAPTER ONE

Causes of Jewish Economic Power

To justify their measures against the Jews the Germans maintain that the former had achieved in important spheres of private and public life a supremacy which it was impossible to tolerate. There is no doubt that this statement concerning the great economic and intellectual influence of the Jews is largely in accordance with the facts. In the first place the banks, secondly the press—in so far as important banks and influential and widely-circulated newspapers were concerned—were in the hands of the Jews in Germany to an extent out of all proportion to their number. But also in the theatre and politics, which are alike in their method of dominating people by stirring and directing their emotions, the Jewish influence, though not quite so important as in banking and in journalism, was still relatively predominant. The position was much the same in the majority of the liberal professions, in particular medicine and law.

After establishing these facts it is usual for both parties to call a halt and to hasten to draw conclusions. The facts alone seem to the government at present ruling in Germany sufficient justification for their measures, because for them a nation is bound to consider foreign influences as something which threatens its very nature and consequently must be eliminated. On the other hand, the Jews prefer either to deny as far as possible the facts, which are undeniable, or to oppose the principle of supremacy of the race with the idea of humanity, of which they feel themselves, rightly or wrongly, the representatives.

Here, however, we need not consider whether the influence of a foreign race is always or even necessarily disastrous for a nation

within which it lives, or whether the principle of race is to be preferred to that of humanity. Of much greater interest for those who follow events in Germany with burning interest, but dispassionately and therefore *cum studio* but *sine ira*, is the question how it was possible for the Jews to attain their indisputable position of power in spheres vital for the nation in which they lived. After all, the Jews did not acquire their positions in the banks or editorial offices, in the theatres and, to a certain extent, in politics and in the free professions, by appearing at the head of armed troops. Two people are always required for every post: one who wants it and one who grants it. It may not be astonishing that the Jews strove for the leading positions in journalism and in the banking world, although this, as will later be shown, does not always seem to have been the case in non-German countries. But why did the Germans give them the positions? Or—if there can be no talk of “giving” in the capitalist world—why did they not occupy the positions themselves seeing they were in an overwhelming majority and that anyone belonging to their race and desiring such a position could in all probability reckon on the support of that majority?

It is true this majority was not quite so overwhelmingly great as might appear at first glance when comparing the 80,000,000 German “Aryans” with the 500,000 German Jews. (Those of mixed blood can be left out of consideration in this connection because, although their number is at the moment greater than those of the pure Jews, they tended to follow the Germans rather than the Jews in their choice of a profession and usually became officers, civil servants, industrialists or professors, but relatively seldom merchants and journalists.) It should be noted that the Jews belong almost exclusively to the towns of mercantile origin and mode of life. Generally speaking, it is only the inhabitants of such towns, and amongst these again, members of the middle class rather than the workers, who have early experience of banks, newspapers and theatres and would therefore be likely to consider them as fields of future activity. Hence the proportion of Germans, who, according to their upbringing, would come into consideration for such posts, to Jews, must not be measured in terms of the total population, but

only in terms of the number of Germans of middle-class origin to the Jews. It is therefore not 100-1 but perhaps only 20-1. As, however, in the positions so occupied the proportion was, to exaggerate a trifle, rather the reverse, the difference in social strata within the German nation and amongst the Jewish people does not suffice to explain such a surprising phenomenon.

Actually the explanation is simple enough; simple, that is, for an unprejudiced observer, of whom there have never been many in discussions of the Jewish question in any country, either amongst the members of the various nations or amongst the Jews themselves, because the important part played by feeling on both sides continually prevented and still prevents the recognition of obvious facts. *The Jews are a race of masters who—in contra-distinction to another foreign minority, the gypsies—instinctively strive to engage in higher occupations and actually do engage in them, but who, in consequence of their being in a minority, can as a rule only turn to those occupations which are despised by the nation with whom they live.* This statement is of decisive importance for the understanding of the Jewish problem, not only in Germany, but in every country in which the number of Jews is worthy of mention.

Every nation lives partly according to its specific character, but to an even greater extent according to a graded valuation of the professions, developed, consciously or unconsciously, under the influence of the common experience of many generations. Once this scale of values has become an integral part of the mentality of the community it can be abandoned only with the greatest difficulty and frequently not at all, even when it is disastrous to the point of destruction.

In Germany, since the establishment of the sovereign principalities, this scale involved that, after the ruling prince, it was the officer who enjoyed the greatest respect, after him or on an equal footing with him the great landowner, after him the civil servant, then the industrialist, the artisan, the peasant, the worker. Lower than all these in social esteem stood the trading class as a whole—apart from exceptional cases and individual judgments as to its social value—and within this class again, during the whole of the eighteenth and

nineteenth centuries, the merchant who dealt in money instead of in real goods: the banker, the bank director, the stockbroker. For the western parts of Germany, in particular the Hansa towns and the Rhineland with their mercantile tradition, this may not have held, or held with the same force, until the twentieth century: there real Germans founded banks and retained control of them. But finally the decisive factor remained the victory of the German east over the German west and south, of the military state Prussia over the spirit of the Hansa towns and of the court and bureaucratic state Austria, which had been excluded from Germany. In eastern and northern Germany "merchant"—"buy-buy man", as they liked to call him—was and remained from then on a title of which the individual who belonged to the class was himself not very proud. Commission agent is and was almost a term of abuse, stockbroking a despised profession. In England, on the contrary, so closely allied in race, and still more in Holland, the merchant was placed by the nation almost at the head of the professions as an honourable necessity and not as a necessary evil, and the commission agent and stockbroker enjoyed general respect, not as an isolated exception—such cases are to be found in Germany too: "He is a merchant but honest"—but as a representative of the vital commercial profession recognised as a vital and worthy calling. And that section of the merchant class which operates with money or with shares and not with goods enjoys greater social prestige than the lower ranks of officers and civil servants, is thought more highly of amongst merchants themselves and gives to those of them who are only moderately successful the feeling of being socially respected; whereas a German does not care to say he is a merchant and even less to admit that he is a stockbroker or a commission agent.

The same is true in still greater measure of the journalist. Bismarck's phrase that only failures become journalists reflects the opinion of the German people as to this calling, even though as rare exceptions one or other of its members were honoured and called to leading positions, as in the case of Bismarck's collaborator Busch. The journalist in Germany was instinctively looked down

upon, was considered a sinister if necessary evil, and just for that reason only those amongst the German middle class turned to it who, accepting the values of their nation, did not feel either for themselves or for their activity that respect which is at all times a condition of successful achievement. In Switzerland, a part of the German nation, which by its historical development was withdrawn at an early stage from the influence of the scale of values prevalent throughout Germany, journalism opened the way to all social honours, indeed was often and still is the springboard to such honours. In England the journalist is considered the courageous and highly esteemed representative of public opinion—a spokesman of democracy, whether he belong to the Right or the Left, united with all the living forces of his people. In Germany he was essentially an outcast, influential only through the fear which he could arouse, necessary on account of the increasing circulation of the newspapers (which likewise was considered a mixed blessing) but necessary only as a pariah may be necessary. In no other country could any statesman have made a remark like Bismarck's about journalists. In no other country could one find such a pityingly contemptuous judgment on the profession as was formulated by a much more favourably inclined representative of the middle classes, namely, Gustav Freytag, in his comedy *The Journalists*. In it, Schmock, the hero, can write to order for the Right or for the Left and the greatest favour one can show him consists in giving him the opportunity of changing over to another small and insignificant occupation. *Go find Livingstone* indicates the difficult tasks with which a journalist may be entrusted in Anglo-Saxon countries. "Take money, give up your profession and thus become a decent fellow" is the view even of the German middle-class writer.

It need not be discussed here whether the valuation of professions by the one or the other nation is correct or incorrect, whether it tends to further or to hinder their development, or even if they are noble or base in terms of some universal ethics for humanity. But the fact that such different valuations exist amongst kindred nations helps to explain why the Jews play a very important role in a profession in one country, while in another their role is insignificant.

Talents are not enough to produce achievements, they are only one of their prerequisites. For their development appropriate values in the intimate environment, the approval and esteem of family, friends and teachers are required. What difficulties had to be overcome by a German aristocrat if he wished to go into business or banking! What opposition a young man belonging to the German middle class had to face if he wished to become a journalist! The English aristocrat on the other hand never forgot that the British Empire was founded on trade, and the patrician of Basle, no matter how arrogant in other respects, considers and honours the newspaper as flesh of his flesh and the gifted journalist as the future leader of the people.

As long as banking and journalism were indispensable to Germany the curious position prevailed that the producers were despised and the products themselves feared. The more the need for banks increased their splendour and wealth, the more influence the journalist gained, the less was the former contempt transformed to love, the more it changed into envy and hatred. For the Germans observed the mysterious phenomenon, which they in their inmost hearts found utterly incomprehensible, that the professions which as a rule could not be adopted by their leading intellects in consequence of lack of interest and hence lack of talent, brought to the Jews to whom they had been voluntarily assigned great social power and a surprising prosperity, often too ostentatiously displayed. This appeared somehow a betrayal of the spirit of the nation, and makes the gradual accumulation of rage comprehensible, if not excusable. As the Germans are inclined to account for every inferiority which manifests itself in them as due to a secret world conspiracy against them, we have here an explanation for the origin of the myth of a Jewish striving after financial world power: whereas in reality no race is less capable of an organised national effort than the Jews, and the necessity of turning only to those professions which were contemptuously accorded to them made any permanent political influence impossible for them.

The Jews had by no means the same dislike as the Germans for the professions disdained in Germany. They wished to engage

in influential occupations and strove for positions in them with all their might. To become officers, civil servants or great landowners was extremely difficult, if possible at all. The only ones which remained open to them were the despised professions, above all the profession of merchant dealing with money and the profession of journalism. As since the Middle Ages dealing in money had been left to them and literary activities were by no means foreign to them—it is not for nothing that the Arabs call the Jews the “People of the Book”—they were naturally far superior in these spheres, as regards the number of talented men, to those failures amongst the Germans who saved themselves on the miserable plank of this profession with secret contempt for themselves.

I once had a chance of listening to a conversation which a high Austrian official—for despite all differences, the German-Austrian branch is in this point very like its German parent and different from the Swiss—had with an intimate Jewish friend before the bank crisis. “Can you explain to me, my dear Director,” asked the Austrian, “why there are so few Christian bank directors of rank and influence in Vienna.” “Because,” the Jewish director promptly replied, “you yourself, if your son were to tell you that he wanted to become a banker, merchant or, still worse, a stockbroker, would immediately reply to him without a moment’s hesitation: ‘Misguided youth, I’ll cut you off with a shilling.’” This fact explains the large majority of Jews in the banking world in both Germany and Austria and the occupation by them of leading positions left vacant in consequence of the psychological attitude of the nationals.

But though the Jews have no objection to these callings, it would be erroneous to assume that they have for journalism and banking a natural specific talent shared by no other nation. In those countries where the antipathy of the Germans to banking and journalism is not shared, the Jews play in both professions either no part at all or a very unimportant one, even when the proportion between their numbers and the total population differs only slightly from the proportion in Germany—as in England with its 0.7% of Jews compared with 0.9% in Germany before 1933, in Switzerland with 0.6%—or even is twice as high as is the case in Holland. In

Switzerland, in spite of the large number of important banks, there is to my knowledge only a single Jewish bank magnate, in England in the "Big Five" very few, in Holland scarcely one in a leading position. For the Christian Swiss, Englishman and Dutchman has himself a definite liking for the honourable and highly-prized post of an influential bank official. Such posts are therefore striven for by a part of its most capable youth, because he loves business, and money and dealing in money does not seem to him instinctively part of the devil's work. What could be more comprehensible than that talents are developed under the influence of such an attitude on the part of the nation, which are quite capable of competing with those of the Jews and that therefore the equally capable, indeed perhaps the more capable native, is preferred when filling such desirable posts.

The same is true in journalism. In Switzerland, whose lawgiver, Eugen Huber, the creator of the clearest civil code in the world, began as an editor; in England, where every statesman is the more esteemed the more literary ability he can show, a Jewish journalist of high standing is occasionally to be found. But in both countries the leading journalists are Aryan Englishmen and Swiss, just as likewise the most influential papers, in so far as they are considered objects of investment, are not, as in Germany and Austria, for the most part in Jewish hands, but only so in isolated cases. Not because the English, Swiss and Dutch Jews, compared with the Austrian and German Jews, have no liking for the newspaper business but because the Aryan German—differing in this respect from the Dutchman, Englishman or Swiss—held aloof from it on account of his deep antipathy, and the necessary enterprises were thus left open by the Germans themselves for Jewish capital.

If further proof be necessary that the Germans refused these posts from an irresistible antipathy and therefore freely assigned them, with the power which they implied, to the Jews, it is provided in a negative manner by what is happening to these professions in Germany at the present time. The expulsion of the Jews in consequence of the National-Socialist Revolution did not have the result that the posts of bank-directors and influential journalists were thereupon

filled by Germans, but simply that these professions no longer exist. The German banks, without exception, have become state departments for the distribution of money and credit, are administered satisfactorily but in a strictly bureaucratic manner and have no opportunity of exercising any initiative. The bank directors are no longer commercial leaders but advisory officials in the state organisation of German economy, filled with a deep sense of obedience. Similarly, the German newspapers have at present only the name in common with what are termed newspapers in England, France, Holland, Switzerland and even Italy. They are distributors of government news, as like as peas and boring to extinction, and they actually are undergoing this extinction and must inevitably do so because they have been deprived of the vital principle of journalism—whether one approves of it or not—namely, the human freedom to express opinions transcending the interests of the state and of the race. The Germans have now got to do without not only the Jews in journalism, but journalism itself, and they apparently can do so. This is shown by the daily passing away of the oldest papers such as the *Vossische Zeitung*, or the prohibition and decline of the other middle-class papers and the fact that the National-Socialist papers do not show an increase in circulation remotely corresponding to what the others have lost. According to German official statistics, the number of German newspapers has fallen since the Revolution by more than half and the number of their readers to one-third.

Again the great importance which the Jews acquired in Germany as politicians is to be explained partly by the fact that there a political song was always a nasty song. A politician is for the German a man who is not so greatly preoccupied with things themselves as with the manner in which he can impose them on others, not so much for their good as for the increase of his own power. A man acts politically, according to the usage of the German language, when he trims his sails to the wind with a certain degree of cunning. Politics were, in spite of all the popular movements in Germany, for centuries something which fell outside and had to fall outside the world of an honest citizen. Since the triumph of the principality in

Germany, the nation has always followed leaders, who carry away the politically untrained masses by means of rhetorical phrases which become a new faith. The conception of the leader and the principle of leadership is not a product of the new Germany. There is no nation in the world in which an individual was so often able to seize control and alter at the same time the character of the whole nation. Charlemagne—as far as Germany and not the French regions are concerned—the Hohenstaufen, Frederick the Great, Bismarck and now Hitler, were not, like Cromwell, Louis XIV or Queen Victoria, the exponents of the nation's will. Originally they imposed their ideas on the nation against its will, and the fact of power alone gave them the authority of legitimacy which, even for a German revolutionary such as Luther, meant the supremely sacred, the inviolable in itself. One might have put up with Jewish politicians. What importance had such a despised class, which never succeeded in making a living power of the German Reichstag! But Jewish leaders like Rathenau were quite impossible, because the calling of leader constituted the highest ideal of all Germans and was therefore reserved for themselves alone. Consequently a leader belonging to another race is inconceivable in Germany, either in the intellectual or the political spheres—in contrast to England which owes its conservative socialism to the Jew Disraeli.

The spiritual attitude of Germany in this connection may be regretted but the fact must be recognised. And just as the exclusion of Jews from banking and journalism meant the end of these professions, so there are leaders in modern Germany—and actually several at the same time—but no longer any politicians. For the essence of politics as a profession is the conviction that it is possible to convert others to one's opinion by means of an argument. The leader, however, is sent by God; his ideas are above all discussion, he issues orders, he does not negotiate and requires neither correction nor instruction.

Undoubtedly the proportion of Jews in the liberal professions and amongst artists, especially writers and actors, reached unusual dimensions and the number of Jewish theatre directors and producers, more particularly in the big towns, was excessively high and

steadily on the increase since the founding of the Reich. From then on, however, a complete change had taken place in the social valuation of the arts despite all official statements to the contrary. The ruling classes in their attitude towards literature had practically returned to the standpoint which Frederick the Great had adopted towards German art, namely, one of total disregard. The classical period, during which the German nation was called, and liked to hear itself called, the nation of poets and thinkers, had not only disappeared with the unification of Germany by blood and iron and the permanent victory of the Prussian spirit, but the change of attitude had taken place almost consciously and deliberately. The artist became once more in Germany what he had been before the classical period, an outsider without influence, a companion for leisure hours which had to be strictly separated from the serious, valuable and disciplined working day. Only in so far as his activity served the official ideals and legends, was he recognised and rewarded by the ruling class. The favourite poet of Wilhelm II was Ernst von Wildenbruch, the patriotic glorifier of the Brandenburg nobility and Prussian history. Only one painter of any standing, Adolf Menzel, was given the title of Excellency, and that not on account of his genius but because of his choice of subject.

To be a literary man is no title to fame in Germany as it is in France, but means one who occupies himself none too seriously with relatively unimportant things and who stands apart from real life. Hence almost every writer of note found himself instinctively in opposition to a society which tended to question the necessity of his existence. Even the officially recognised poet of the nation, Gerhart Hauptmann, who in 1913 was invited as a rare exception to compose the official festival play for the hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Leipsic, had the experience of seeing his work disappear completely from the programme on command from above, because it was not written according to the official clichés. And as everyone in the long run makes a virtue of necessity, the genuine artist, finally under the influence of Stefan George, became in his own eyes and those of the younger generation with poetical talents, a high priest who shut himself off from the vulgarity of everyday

life and voluntarily and willingly refused to exert any direct influence on it. No wonder that the number of Jewish writers and painters increased relative to that of the Germans, since the conception of starving and world-remote artists still persisted amongst the German upper classes, indeed acquired fresh strength, at a time when the hunger for reading of the politically uninfluential masses was producing huge editions, which provided many talented men not only with a bare living but even a considerable measure of prosperity.

This conception of art as an occupation for leisure hours, not wholly worthy of a seriously active man, produced an even greater effect in the world of the theatre. In contrast to Austria where the actor was frequently the hero of the hour for everyone from the Court down to the humblest classes, in Germany he bore the stigma of the vagabond longer than in any other European country. Whereas the youth of the Jewish middle class tended to look up to the theatre as to a land of promise and if endowed with talent seldom, if ever, had to overcome serious opposition from his family, a German, even of the middle class, who wished to become an actor had practically to face social death. Consequently German theatres were overrun, not only with Jewish, but also with Austrian actors, as this section of the German race had never shared the German valuation of this activity and as a result of their more favourable attitude had produced an abundance of talent. As the entire business of the theatre in Germany, in so far as it was a matter of private initiative, was considered as not really serious and a German could not help feeling a distaste from having anything to do with it, it was left predominantly to the Jews—a state of affairs which became more and more intolerable in Germany the longer it lasted, although the ruling classes never made any serious effort to alter the psychological basis of this social phenomenon. The resulting situation was even more grotesque than in journalism: the products were considered necessary, the producers remained foreigners, even though admired and acclaimed as the ~~exotic~~ ambassadors of an exotic realm.

In a letter written shortly before the National-Socialist Revolution,

a German friend bitterly complained to me about the excesses in the conduct of the Jewish, and in particular of the Berlin theatre clique, which made it impossible for any German talent to come to the fore. The reproach of extravagant behaviour and a predominantly clique policy was largely justified and made a deep impression on me, as it was bound to do on anyone who had had any opportunity of following the activities of many theatre directors and manufacturers of operettas. But it was a mistake on the part of the writer, though one which I and many others shared with him, to regard as a cause what was in reality only an effect. The clique was not there first and stifled German talent, but on the contrary it was the views of the German ruling classes on the value of the theatre which prevented talent from developing. After the victory of the National-Socialists, respectable and disreputable, talented and untalented Jewish theatre directors were swept away and Jewish actors disappeared almost altogether from the German stage, so completely indeed that their presence even in films is forbidden. The presentation of an Elizabeth Bergner film in Berlin, apart altogether from the official prohibition which immediately followed, threatened to provoke disturbances. But now neither the Aryan libretto writers nor the Aryan operetta composers or leading theatre directors are making use of the vacated field: they simply do not exist. What can be seen in the theatres of Berlin to-day, once the leading theatre city of the world, need not be criticised by a foreigner: the Germans themselves express clearly enough what they think of it, not in words, but simply by staying away.

The above explanation for the excessive proportion of Jews in certain professions in Germany explains also their complete absence in others. In Imperial Germany not only were Jews excluded from being officers, even officers of the reserve, but they also appeared only in quite isolated cases amongst the higher Civil Service officials or great landowners,—by no means in the numbers corresponding to their proportion of the population and even less to their wealth. Similarly, even under the post-War Republic these posts were automatically, if not quite so exclusively, reserved for Germans—not in consequence of specific laws but by the unexpressed will of the

ruling classes. The extension of the Aryan paragraph to the German Reichswehr only resulted in the dismissal, according to official sources, of five officers, two cadets and thirty-one non-commissioned officers and men, a total, that is, of thirty-eight out of the 100,000 members of the Reichswehr. Granting now that the Aryan paragraph did not apply to Jews who had served in the War, these figures nevertheless establish at least the one fact that during the Republican period only thirty-eight Jews, and of them only five officers, had been able to obtain military posts, and it is likely that more than the half of these were not pure Jews, but of mixed descent who only lacked the woman most desired in modern Germany, the Aryan grandmother. The profession of arms still headed the list of professions even in post-War Germany, and here there was no question of pushing out the Jews but of their practical exclusion from the very first, because members of an alien race can never conquer posts desired by nationals and only in quite exceptional cases can, as it were, creep into them.

The law that a nation automatically reserves esteemed professions for its own members holds in its negative form: the less the inclination towards a profession on the part of the nationals, the greater the extent to which it is occupied by aliens. Thus the Bavarians and the Austrians have no particular antipathy to the calling of officer, but also no such strong preference for it as has the North German. The practical consequence was that although there were scarcely any Jews among the active officers, Bavaria was the only German state in which Jews could be reserve officers, even under the Emperor, while in Austria they had no difficulties of any sort to contend with in this connection.

How little any specific talent amongst German Jews determined their activity in any particular profession may be seen from a consideration of their share in the development of industry in the Rhine district and in Silesia. Whereas in the Rhineland there are no Jews among the founders of modern industry the greatest part of the Silesian industry was founded and dominated by Jews. The Germans of the Rhineland, in consequence of their old tradition, were strongly attracted by industrial production and trade, founded,

therefore, the industries themselves, and secured for themselves the leading positions in them. In Silesia, on the other hand, where the bulk of the population—great landowners and peasants—had little inclination for industry although the region was in just as great need of industrial development, the posts were left open to the Jews on account of this antipathy and they took part in the foundation of all industries there to such an astonishing extent that until the National-Socialist Revolution not only commercial undertakings, but also productive enterprises, were almost entirely in the hands of Jews.

Even in little things confirmation of this law may be found. Thus the Austrian loves the Civil Service and consequently few Jews were ever to be found in it because the Austrians reserved these coveted posts for themselves. Only in two branches of the Civil Service were the Jews always numerous, because they were not so attractive to the nationals as they tended to make the members in them anything but loved: among tax-assessors and in the police force the number of Jews exceeded their proportion of the population.

Similarly, conditions outside Germany afford corroboration for the contention that Jews occupy only those positions which are scorned by the nationals. Thus, generally speaking, in the majority of professions in Switzerland their numbers correspond to, or are even less than, their proportion of the population. In two professions, however, their numbers are greatly in excess of that proportion—the legal profession and on the stage. The Swiss Christian does not think highly of either of these professions. For him the lawyer is usually considered the legal quibbler, not far removed from the commission agent, and in many cases lawyers prefer to call their offices debt-collecting offices (*Inkassobüros*), a thing which never occurs in France or England. Administrative officials have no liking for the intervention of the lawyer because it is held that the free citizen dealing with the citizen as official has no need of any intermediary. Further, their general standard, with few exceptions, is not particularly high. And because the German Swiss is not eager to become a lawyer, although the legal profession is

much more essential than his feelings allow, vacant posts are relatively numerous and open to the Jews, whereas even in French Switzerland the situation is quite different. In the same way the German Swiss, who likes the spirit of middle class, is not particularly interested in the arts, has no great love for acting and actors, but at the same time cannot do without them altogether. The instinctive aversion of the peasant and middle-class citizen against any member of the family turning artist, and above all, actor, is still strong. For that reason there are surprisingly few theatres of any standing in Switzerland considering the wealth of the country, and among the actors many foreigners, including a large number of Jews. In Holland the number of Jews even in trade is on the average not much higher than their percentage quota. One branch alone, the diamond trade—for which the Dutchman, the friend of tulips not of stones, has no great liking—is monopolised by Jews. They also provide the majority of the officers in many Dutch colonies, as military service in the tropics is none too popular in the Netherlands. In Surinam almost 90% of the officers are Jews.

The history of the Jews in Poland furnishes another convincing example. According to the detailed investigations of a Polish scholar, in the sixteenth century there were no Christian master artisans there whatever. The gap was filled by the Jews who plied the most varied handicrafts including trades most incompatible with the modern conception of the Jewish talents, such as pewterer, cutler and gunmaker. Later the Christian Poles in the towns conquered their aversion to the handicrafts but in the country it was still left in the hands of the Jews so that as late as 1868 the President of the Galician Diet, during the debate on equal rights for Jews, declared that only a short time before, "especially in the country, there were no handicraftsmen other than Jews". With the development of a Polish bourgeoisie the Jews went more into commerce and practically monopolised down to the present day two particularly detested higher occupations: that of factors to the great landowners, who were indispensable to the high nobility, despite the contemptuous treatment they received, and that of innkeeper. Only a few years ago a Polish friend explained to me that he divided

all Polish Jews into three classes—the descendants of factors, of innkeepers and of rabbis: he recognised the first by their cunning, the second by their violence, with which they had always been ready to throw a drunken peasant out, while the third were gentle, world-remote, devoted only to God and the knowledge of God.

It is not improbable that the same process of leaving to the Jews distasteful but necessary occupations was going on at the time of the Roman Empire. Then also there was no sign of any specific talent for commerce in the Jews. The Romans, like the English, had also special gifts for trade and consequently the wholesale trade in particular was practically monopolised by the highly esteemed class of knights (*equites*). Hence, in the opinion of Ludwig Friedlaender, one of the greatest authorities on the history of Roman customs and economics, there is absolutely no ground whatever for believing that the Jews at that time were chiefly or even to any great extent engaged in commerce or finance: on the contrary, there is much to be said against such a view. They were to be found rather amongst the independent handicraftsmen: and again the Romans had a distinct antipathy to such occupations. "It has been estimated," says Georg Caro in his *Economic History of the Jews*, "that more than a hundred of the sages of the Talmud carried on handicrafts which were despised by the classical peoples. In the great Synagogue of Alexandria each handicraft had its allotted place. Gold and silversmiths, nail and needle makers, blacksmiths and weavers occupied separate sections so that the foreigners of the same trade could easily find work with them." In addition to these necessary but despised professions the Jews were also engaged in another profession arousing no great sympathy—that of farmer of taxes. Amongst the tax-receipts on clay tablets found near Thebes and belonging to Roman times many names of Jewish tax-collectors were found.

The same process may be observed throughout the Middle Ages. Credit economy, as far as it existed then, necessarily involved the lending of money against interest. As this was strictly forbidden by the Church, the hated and accursed but necessary activity was left for the most part to the Jews by all nations. These took over the

function of the usurer—and everything connected with credit was usury—which alone afforded them any chance of exerting influence and made it possible for them in certain cases to amass wealth and to live with considerable ostentation, in a word to lead the life typical of the Jewish community—difficult and dangerous, persecuted and successful. As soon as the canonical prohibition was no longer effective the Jews had to abandon their function wherever the nation itself possessed ability for finance, as in North Italy in particular, and only retained it in those parts of Europe in which the psychological attitude of the nation remained hostile to it.

The Jews were handicraftsmen where the nation had no liking for handicrafts, merchants where trade was hated, moneylenders when moneylending was necessary but forbidden, tax collectors and innkeepers when these occupations were dangerous and bringing little honour. Everywhere and at all times the principle remains true that it was the necessary but despised influential professions which were left open for occupation by the Jews.

Everything of course cannot be explained by it. The high percentage of Jewish scholars and scientists in Germany, the Jewish influence on the development of industry, the large number of Jewish lawyers and doctors have other grounds which will be elaborated in the course of this study. But fundamentally the statement holds that professions, vital or considered vital for a nation during a particular period, but hated by its nationals, were left to the Jews without a struggle, gave them influence and made them feared and despised as the representatives of such professions.

The position in Germany before the National-Socialist Revolution was only unusual inasmuch as some of the professions in which Jews were prominent had failed or seemed to have done so. The unrestricted liberty of the press which led to the creation of a so-called "revolver-press", for the most part managed and written by Jews just as the respectable papers were, led to a feeling that it might be better to abandon the press altogether as a means for the expression of public opinion, as apparently it did more damage than good. The collapse of the financial and credit organisations in Germany and Austria and the necessity of state intervention in

support of the banks fostered the opinion that capitalism was approaching its end in this sphere and should be replaced by a credit organisation under the control of the State. This appeared all the more imperative as the State, often against its will, had had to acquire a majority of the shares of the big banks, as in the case of the Oesterreichischen Creditanstalt, the Dresdener Bank and the Darmstaedter Bank, and at the same time to become their greatest creditor, in consequence of the necessity of aiding them by credit grants. The failure of these professions made the Jews appear superfluous just at the time when, as a result of the economic crisis, they were deprived of their only means of defence, namely money. In view of this failure of certain professions it would have been comprehensible, if not altogether just, if the Jews as the chief representatives had come into disrepute and if their exclusion from the economic life of the nation had been one of the main objectives of the National-Socialist struggle. But curiously enough the whole force of the measures was first not so much directed against the Jews in commerce as against the Jews in the liberal professions—a phenomenon unique in the history of measures against Jews and which therefore may contribute to a comprehension of the peculiarities of the German mind. The unusual nature of the German measures against the Jews at the beginning of the National-Socialist régime was even more astonishing than their severity.

CHAPTER TWO

Peculiarities of the Anti-Jewish Campaign in Germany

Persecution of the Jews and measures against them are by no means uncommon in the history of many nations. The present German campaign however, exhibits peculiarities which distinguish it from all others. Originally it was not so much directed against Jewish money and the Jewish religion as against the Jewish spirit; and the reason given for it was the new faith in the supremacy of blood and of race. The unusual aim of this campaign and its equally unusual motivation have produced extraordinary and unprecedented effects and are likely to produce even more remarkable ones in the future.

Until now, four groups of reasons may be distinguished for the persecution of the Jews—religious, cultural, political and economic—sometimes acting separately but more frequently in various combinations.

The religious reasons were rooted in the anger aroused by obstinate adherents to a belief rendered obsolete by the coming of Christ, denying what the Christian world held most dear, and in addition, opposing the claims of the Catholic Church to universality. The religious feeling which at the time of the Crusades caused the Christians to attack the infidels in possession of the Holy Sepulchre was at the same time directed against the infidels in their midst.

This cause of a large number of the persecutions of the Jews may be recognised by the fact that to abjure Judaism, if only in appearance, and to accept Christianity, was sufficient for bringing the persecutions to an immediate end. The Jewish community of Trier escaped the pogroms of the Middle Ages, which took place

for the first time in Germany at Speyer, Mainz and Worms, because the members made haste to be baptised. The Marrannes, Spanish Jews, baptised and Christians to all appearances, escaped exile and persecution as long as their secret religious practices remained unknown. The Spain of Isabella the Catholic, it is true, also attached great importance to racial purity, but for fundamentally different reasons from those advanced by modern Germany: racial purity seemed the necessary condition for full acceptance of Christianity, a guarantee against the hostility towards Catholicism which, as experience seemed to show, was difficult to eradicate in those of Jewish blood. This racial purity therefore had no value in itself but was the prerequisite of a sincere faith. Those whose faith was beyond question had not to suffer in consequence of their descent, and several outstanding renegade Jews who had become Inquisitors were allowed to continue in office. When, in 1183, the Jews were expelled from France, those who had been baptised were permitted to remain. In Lithuania in the sixteenth century hereditary nobility was conferred by law on all Jews who embraced Christianity. In Germany and in Austria, at a time when the Jews were excluded by law and in practice from all official positions, baptism opened to them the way to influential posts. Such was the case, in Vienna under Marie Theresa, of Joseph von Sonnenfels, and likewise at a later date of the Minister of Justice, Unger, who revised the Austrian Civil Code, and Glaser, the founder of the Austrian Criminal Code. Even in Berlin, where before the War a bourgeois and still less a Jew scarcely ever became a Minister, we have similar cases, such as those of Friedberg who became Minister of Justice, and Dernburg, the Secretary of State. Everywhere the Jew by denouncing his religion could escape the measures directed against his community. Even to-day certain Catholic circles consider baptism the only efficacious remedy for anti-Semitism. Did not a Catholic priest, Bela Bangha, in a work which appeared in 1934, maintain that the Jewish question could only be solved if the Jews from inner conviction cultivated a more sympathetic understanding of Christianity which would modify their attitude to it as a religion and hence to all Christian nations? Only such a solution would be in

conformity with the tradition and the teachings of the Catholic and Protestant Churches.

At first, closely connected with the religious causes, the cultural reasons gradually acquired in the course of the centuries a significance of their own. Unwilling to accept the culture of the nations which gave them hospitality, disdainful of their habits and customs even as regards the details of everyday life, the pride and arrogance of the Jews irritated the Egyptians under the Roman Empire to such an extent that the outbursts of this mutual antipathy caused as much bloodshed as the measures of the National-Socialists, the pogroms of the Middle Ages or those of Czarist Russia. It was this haughty withdrawal from participation in the life of the community which drew upon the Jews—who had been favoured in every possible way by Julius Caesar and other leading Roman statesmen—the hatred and contempt of the Romans of the Empire. Their refusal to recognise the Emperor as divine and omnipotent was attributed not so much to their belief in a God who, as a spirit, had no real being for the Romans—a belief which earned them the reputation of atheists—as to their conviction of being the Chosen People. "Everything we hold sacred," says Tacitus, "is despised by them and what is permissible to them inspires us with horror," and he makes no exception for the converted Jews. Another writer of the Imperial epoch, Philostratus, declares that "the Jews refuse to take any part in our social life, they share with others neither the table nor the libations nor the prayers nor the sacrifices and are more remote from us than Susa, Bactria or the Indies". In this connection the present situation in Germany differs likewise from that which in 1497 brought about the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. According to the very interesting accounts recently published by Valeriu Marcu, at the beginning the struggle in Spain was not directed against the orthodox Jews but against the Marrannes, the baptised Jews, hence, as in Germany, against that section of the Jewish community which had approached most closely to the national culture. Nevertheless, in Spain the majority of the converts, and still more those who had not been converted, continued to practise Judaism in secret, whereas in Germany not only all converts

without exception, but even the majority of other Jews, had voluntarily renounced their Jewish customs to adopt those of the nation in which they lived. In the nineteenth century the eagerness of the Jews to abandon their traditions in order to embrace German culture is at least as strange as the hostility which developed against them in Germany in spite of all their efforts.

At the end of the eighteenth century and even during the nineteenth, the stubbornness with which the Jews held fast to a world of thought which was essentially their own, but which remained incomprehensible for others, their categorical refusal to accept the religion, the culture and the beliefs of the nations in whose midst they lived, was one of the chief causes of the resistance to their emancipation. Napoleon, formulating with his usual clarity the feeling of his time, made the equality of French Jews in France depend in part on an affirmative reply to the following question presented to the Assembly of 100 Jewish notables: "Is the acceptance of French culture and the recognition of State institutions compatible with Jewish religion and philosophy?" Similarly, in England in the nineteenth century the acceptance of the cultural ideal of the nation amongst whom they lived—however vague it might be—seems to have been everywhere the first condition for the emancipation of the Jews and baptism was not so much a religious act as the symbol of fusion with the culture of the nation.

Religious reasons play no part in the present anti-Jewish movement in Germany. The religious argument, so frequently advanced in former times, according to which the Jews had crucified the Redeemer and continued to deny Him and His teaching, could have no value for National-Socialism whose most radical representatives, with official approval, qualified the adoption of Christianity by Germans as an anti-national act and whose moderate leaders have no desire to enrich Christian doctrine but to combine it with the idea of race. The only serious opposition to the Revolution came from Catholic and Protestant circles. They alone protested against the application to the Churches of the "Aryan decree". More than 800 pastors risked their position because they refused to admit that the racial theory which had become a dogma of the

State took precedence over the Christian dogma of the equality of all races and the right of everyone to salvation. The German authorities were compelled to act not for, but against Christianity, in their attempts to force anti-Jewish measures upon the Church.

The second reproach made against the Jews, frequently with justice, of not participating in the culture of the nations receiving them, of isolating themselves intellectually but nevertheless of gaining economic power within them, is less justified in Germany than elsewhere. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Jews followed in the wake of German culture with manifest enthusiasm, often sacrificing their beliefs and invariably their traditions, so that Heine could already say that baptism was an admission card to European civilisation. National-Socialism has never reproached the Jews with refusing to collaborate with German culture, but on the contrary with having taken such a prominent part in it that measures were necessary to protect it.

Again, in the political field the anti-Jewish movement in Germany differs from similar movements in other countries. The German princes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and above all the Russian ruling classes during the nineteenth century, made use of the very human dislike of the alien as a safety valve to divert from themselves the hostility, whether justified or not, of the masses. Thus in Wurtemberg in the eighteenth century, the extravagance of the court and the resulting unsound condition of public finance, were laid at the door of the Jew Süss, Financial Minister of the Ruler, who, when riots threatened to overthrow the dynasty, was sent to the scaffold to pacify the discontented people. Similarly in Russia, when poverty became acute and political discontent rife, the government employed *agents provocateurs* to stir up pogroms as an excellent means of directing the revolutionary movement into channels less dangerous to Czarism. The Dreyfus affair was probably of similar origin, and due ultimately not so much to anti-Semitism as to a desire on the part of the government to cover up abuses—especially in the Army—by focussing attention on one man as responsible for them and thus to have them accepted as exceptional.

In Germany, on the other hand, after the Treaty of Versailles, it was not the government which proclaimed anti-Semitical principles but the National-Socialist opposition, even long before it had triumphed. It is true it did gain many followers with this point of its programme, but it by no means came to power on that account. When Schleicher fell, the decisive reason for bringing Hitler to power was the fear that the scandals in connection with the East German Aid (*Osthilfe*) would be brought to light and undermine the prestige and power of the landed nobility in Prussia. Anti-Semitism played no part in it. Undoubtedly it was frequently maintained that the Jews and the Socialists had caused Germany to lose the War, but the circles in which this view predominated constituted the opposition and, contrary to the tactics employed by so many governments, neither the Marx nor the Schleicher Cabinet made use of the legend of "the stab in the back", spread abroad against the Jews and Socialists, to divert from themselves the discontent of the masses. That anti-Semitism alone would not have been sufficient to bring National-Socialism to power is abundantly proved by the loss of votes which the National-Socialists suffered at the last elections to the Reichstag in December 1932, just before the Reichstag fire. The National-Socialist opposition lost several million votes, although the government of the period had not taken the slightest legal measures against the Jews.

Of much greater importance than religious, cultural and political reasons in the motivation of anti-Jewish campaigns since the end of the Middle Ages, are the economic reasons. In modern times Jews have most frequently been persecuted or expelled because, dominating the financial market which had been abandoned to them, they had acquired too much power. This fact, and perhaps a certain arrogance displayed by some when successful, had caused them to be detested: hence as soon as the Jews became too rich they were squeezed like too full sponges. The fear of a predominance of Jewish finance, the desire to eliminate too able competitors, together with religious motives, caused the Jews to be expelled from Vienna in 1679, almost against the will of the ruler. Even

when the Jews were not expelled, measures were taken against them which either ruined them or deprived them of a considerable part of their wealth. These measures constituted for the prince an important source of revenue, whether they took the form of penalties imposed on fortunes too rapidly amassed or of payments for a further period of indulgence. The wealth of the successful Jews—the others lived and still live, especially in Eastern Europe, in the most abject poverty—was at all times a cause of popular wrath.

The argument of the intolerable economic predomination of the Jews was frequently used for propaganda purposes by the National-Socialists before they came to power. What is extraordinary, however, is that this argument was admitted to be false, even by the victors, as soon as they had triumphed. In contrast to what had so often happened since the Middle Ages, the Jews in Germany had lost both fortune and position before they were the victims of repressive measures.

Long before Hitler came to power the German Jews were in an extremely precarious situation, rendered all the more difficult because during the preceding period of prosperity their standard of life had steadily risen and their needs remained after they had lost the means of satisfying them. Not only in the banking world and on the Stock Exchange, but also to a large extent in commerce, the majority of Jews who had formerly occupied positions which were envied and despised at the same time, had been ruined by the post-War capitalist crisis. If ever the persecution of the Jews had been necessary for economic reasons, it was most certainly not at that particular time because fate had impoverished the rich Jews more than even the expulsions had ever done during the Middle Ages.

The collapse of the Austrian Creditanstalt, whose directors were Jewish, was the Sedan of the Jews. The decline of the Austrian Rothschilds proved to be the starting point of the crisis, due to a loss of confidence which led to the difficulties of the German banks and the ruin of the German bankers. The eviction of the Jews from this field therefore, took place by itself, as the failure of the banks

necessarily involved the dismissal of their directors and their employees. This process had not only begun in Germany and Austria before March 1933, it was almost completed by then. The dismissal of the directors and of a large number of Jewish employees of the Austrian Creditanstalt, the Dresdener Bank and the Darmstaedterbank, took place long before that date and was not dictated by racial or anti-Jewish consideration but by the fact that success decides in every enterprise and that in this particular case it was failure. No one paused to consider whether in America the leading bankers, almost all of them Christians, had not likewise proved themselves unequal to their task, particularly as it was obvious that the Jewish bankers in Austria and in Germany, apart from all questions of crisis, had committed personal and avoidable blunders in consequence of a kind of megalomania characteristic of such circles.

The same was more or less true of other branches of commerce in which the majority of leading positions were held by Jews. The big departmental stores whose founders and owners were almost exclusively Jews—Tietz, Wertheim, Alsberg, Ronker, Konitzer—had ceased to be safe enterprises but were heavily in debt. Many Jewish private bankers were ruined partly by bankrupt customers, partly by the fall of prices on the Stock Exchange. As for the wholesale trade in which Jews were numerous, the steady decline in turnover had resulted in many businesses changing hands. This unfortunate condition of the influential Jewish classes, envied on account of their luxury, had nevertheless one remarkable consequence unique in the history of anti-Semitism—the reason for which the attack on them had been begun no longer existed. For the time being there was nothing to attack.

As is well-known the boycott of the Jewish shops and merchants was originally to have lasted a week but was finally reduced to one day, to the great disappointment of the younger members of the Party. And even this day was a Saturday, a half-holiday for the shops, when in any case the shops of the orthodox Jews were closed. The responsible leaders of National-Socialism had recognised in time that a bankrupt is no object of conquest. Boycotting the Jews

for any greater length of time would only have rendered them less solvent. And the managers of these shops (for they were usually proprietors only in name) would undoubtedly have suffered less than the banks. As the banks in their turn could only carry on with the help of credits from the State, it was finally the State which would have lost. If the banks on the other hand had refused the money it would have been the manufacturers, one of the ruling classes in Germany, who would have suffered, because their merchandise would not have been paid for, and most of these manufacturers were Germans not Jews.

The economic boycott was therefore of short duration and at first applied with any severity only against the Jewish directors of theatres. In commerce, it affected chiefly small merchants and shopkeepers and those in the country rather than in the big towns, only being enforced against the last-named much later. However, the principle which had inspired this idea of a boycott was by no means abandoned, for a government and especially a revolutionary government establishing itself in power can never leave a path on which it has started. Thus it was that the struggle began against the Jewish spirit and against the Jews in the liberal professions, a struggle which till then had been conducted only by a few outsiders of no great influence, such as Schoenerer in politics, Dühring and H. St. Chamberlain in the intellectual sphere. But this struggle found itself faced by a very different situation from that directed against Jewish predomination in the economic field. It had therefore to base itself on different arguments.

In the liberal professions, in law and medicine, just as in banking and journalism, the Jews undoubtedly occupied a relatively preponderant position and were actually in an absolute majority in the big towns. That was a consequence of the general law that positions disdained by the nationals were abandoned to aliens. For if Germans had less antipathy to medicine and law than to banking, stockbroking and journalism, these professions were nevertheless far from enjoying high social prestige in their eyes. The very fact that they were liberal professions lowered them in the scale of values of a people for whom the official had always been

surrounded by the halo of power. This fact even found expression in the administration of the law. Thus, in Prussia, a certain number of marks was necessary for a pass in the State examination qualifying an entrant to become a barrister, but more marks were required to enter the magistracy. Again, whereas in France lawyers constitute the most numerous group in the *Chambre*, they were seldom members of the Reichstag in Germany under the Empire—there were not very many more under the Republic. Amongst doctors too there was a similar discrimination. The panel doctors, with less social prestige under the Empire, were Jews for the most part, as such posts were not highly prized by the Aryans. It was only when increasing poverty rendered these posts desirable that the National-Socialist Revolution drove the Jews out of them.

Nevertheless, although the position in the liberal professions was very much the same as in banking and journalism as far as numbers were concerned, a striking difference was to be noted. Whereas the activities of some of the powerful Bank Directors and financiers had aimed primarily at amassing wealth and their effects on German economic life had been definitely harmful in many cases, this could not be said of the liberal professions. No complaints were ever made against the morality of Jewish lawyers and doctors. Here there was no question of abuses nor had the Jews proved failures. Nor could there be any talk of a monopoly. The German Aryan who wished to use a bank, to sell shares on the Stock Exchange or to read a better newspaper, was obliged, on account of the dislike of his compatriots for these professions, to satisfy his desire by using a bank either entirely or partially under Jewish control, or to buy a paper on which Jews were working. There were too few other big banks or interesting papers, at any rate in the big towns. On the other hand, the liberal professions such as law and medicine were never abandoned to the Jews to the same extent. Aryan lawyers were doubtless less numerous than Jewish lawyers but they could satisfy very large numbers of clients. If the Germans had felt any real antipathy towards Jewish lawyers, the Aryan lawyers should have had very big and important practices and the Jewish lawyers much smaller ones,

as no one was obliged to consult a Jewish lawyer. The contrary was actually the case. The fact that a very considerable part of the population turned to Jewish lawyers despite the existence of Aryan competitors—even Hindenburg's lawyer was a Jew—indicates that in this field the German people had a real confidence in the Jews, which was seldom misplaced, and that they considered the spirit animating the Jewish representatives of this calling useful, necessary and, above all, anything but hostile. Indeed the public preference for Jewish lawyers even after the National-Socialist Revolution was such that, after an attack on them in the National-Socialist paper *Der Mitteldeutsche* in February 1934, many National-Socialist lawyers in Magdeburg had their names smuggled into a list of Jewish advocates, published to warn the public, in order to profit by their good reputation.

The same state of affairs prevailed in medicine. The position of the doctor without official standing was never coveted, but the population obviously preferred Jewish doctors, in spite of Aryan competition, to such an extent that before the War it was by no means rare to find in bourgeois novels the family doctor represented by a Jew who was frequently used as a foil to a villainous Jewish usurer or stock-broker.

The situation was a little different for the Jews amongst University lecturers and professors. The University professor was an official and as such a representative, to a certain extent, of the power of the State. Consequently if he did not rank as highly as the officer or the landowner in the scale of social values he nevertheless had the standing of a higher government official. Hence the Jews could only obtain such posts, or even the readerships leading to them, with great difficulty. Why the Jews nevertheless were still very numerous in the Universities, although in nothing like the same predominant position as in law, will be explained later when analysing the psychology of the Jews before the Revolution. Here it need only be pointed out that no complaint was ever made against their subversive influence, just as little as against the activities of Jewish lawyers and doctors. There was also no grounds for such complaint, which cannot be said of the activities of certain

Peculiarities of Anti-Jewish Campaign

Jewish journalists and financiers. It is true that people talked in a general way of the Judaisation of the Universities, but no serious accusations were seldom if ever made. Instead of defining the evil influence of Jewish scholars, or even how they deviated from the national outlook, critics confined themselves to compiling statistics of the Jews in the profession, while at the same time professing their great esteem for the persons of the professors thus indirectly attacked merely on a matter of principle. Even the prophets of the modern racial creed were no exception to this rule: Houston Stewart Chamberlain dedicated his principal work, *The Foundations of the 19th Century*, to the Jewish physiologist, Julius Wiesner; the official philosopher of modern Germany, Heidegger, was a pupil of the Jew, Edmund Husserl, the founder of phenomenology; and even on the eve of the National-Socialist Revolution, the ultra-nationalist and conservative University of Breslau called the Frankfurt lecturer Cohn to the Chair of Civil Law, an appointment which provoked a storm of protest amongst the students, not on scientific but on political grounds. Before the National-Socialist Revolution there was so little question of the disastrous influence of Jewish spirit in the liberal and academic professions that scarcely one in a hundred of the articles attacking the Jews was directed against Jewish lawyers and professors.

In the theatrical world it is true, complaints against Jewish directors were many and bitter, but few were ever made against actors, singers and instrumentalists who outnumbered them. A single case attracted attention during the years preceding the National-Socialist Revolution, and the Nationalist papers in Germany and Austria took advantage of it to attack the corruption of Jewish actors. Alexander Moissi, either from scientific interest or from curiosity, had been present at a confinement in an obstetric clinic and was attacked as a corruptor of youth—whether justly or not is doubtful, because accounts of the incident by attackers and defenders differed widely. This gave rise to diatribes on the anti-German sexual perversions of Jewish actors. It turned out afterwards that Moissi was not a Jew but an Aryan of half-German, half-Italian origin. Apart from this controversy, little was said about the

Judaisation of the theatre by the actors. As for the theatre directors and operetta manufacturers against whom protests were frequent, they should be classified as purveyors of trash rather than as intellectual workers. The first German-speaking actor, who was raised to the nobility and considered a perfect gentleman even by the very exclusive Austrian aristocracy, was a Jew, Sonnenthal, and even Richard Wagner, who in his book *Jewry in Music* so violently attacked Jewish theatre directors, critics and composers, had so little against practising musicians that he engaged the Jew Levi as conductor for *Parsifal* and constantly employed Jewish singers at Bayreuth. From 1920 to 1930 under Cosima Wagner, who was even more Pan-German than her husband, the Jewish singer Friedrich Schorr played the part of Wotan in *Nibelungen*, and the National-Socialist *Handbook on the Jewish Question* even to-day still recognises indirectly the invaluable support given by the Jews to the German theatre by including quite naturally amongst the Jews the most brilliant of the German actors, Joseph Kainz, although he had not a single drop of Jewish blood.

Such was the state of affairs when, shortly after Hitler had taken control, it was found impossible to attack the economic influence and power of the Jews for lack of any real objective, partly because it is absurd to attack a corpse and partly because the interests of the German people would greatly have suffered. It was therefore not against the Jewish merchants, the owners of the big stores and the financiers, that the campaign was directed. They did not attack the commercial principles of people like Sklarz or the excessive optimism of many bankers, but they fell with incredible violence on those classes of the Jews against whom reproaches of mistakes, greed or insolent ostentation could not be levelled. The campaign against the economic power of the Jews was postponed and only inaugurated much later, not as something primary but as a consequence of the principle of dictatorship. But the fight began at once against the Jewish spirit. It was, however, this attack which, whether justified or not, astounded foreign nations and produced a most unfavourable attitude to Germany. For the eradication of Jewish influence in the liberal professions resulted in the most

poignant tragedies and comedies which raised for everyone, quite apart from the individual case, the question as to what were the limits of the power of the State and of the ideas of the rulers as against human dignity and the claims of reason—a question which affected mankind as a whole.

Who could forget the fate of Professor Jacobson? He had spent his whole life collaborating on an atlas of the German language for the purpose of following its development in the various districts. One of the first to be deprived of his office, he threw himself under a train in despair at seeing himself rejected by the nation which he loved and for which alone he had lived. Who can read the names of the Jewish scholars who had succeeded in obtaining Chairs at Universities or laboratories—with more difficulty undoubtedly than German non-Jews—and were leading simple and disinterested lives, without regretting that Germany should have thought it necessary to deprive itself of these workers for the future and in the interests of that future? What a pitiful comedy to see the German Congress of Psychotherapy in 1934, as was related to me by eye-witnesses, vote a motion recognising as the principal methods for the psychological treatment of neurasthenia that of the Swiss Jung and those of the Jews Sigmund Freud and Alfred Adler, when it was not possible for a Jew to speak at the Congress. The same year at another congress one of the speakers, a well-known personality, boasted of the discovery of a new remedy for malaria “which could be placed side by side with other discoveries of German science such as Salversan and Germanin” forgetting that Salversan, the specific against syphilis, had been discovered by the Jew Ehrlich and the Japanese Hata.

A foreigner might have conceded that it was necessary, though not justifiable, from the National-Socialist standpoint, to suppress Jewish influence and hence the activity of many individuals, but what rendered the German mentality so incomprehensible to Europeans, Americans and Asiatics alike, was the fact that the Germans could continue to make use of the fruits of Jewish invention while at the same time repudiating the inventors, whether alive or dead. And the particular cases—particular cases, but embodiments

of ideas—opened a wider gulf between Germany and other nations than did their racial creed or economic boycott. This above all is one of the principal causes for the present deplorable intellectual isolation of the Third Reich.

Still, a case might be made out for providing German agriculture with calcium nitrate according to the methods of the Jew, Nicodemus Caro, for continuing to produce poison gases which the Jew, Fritz Haber was the first to invent, or to continue to make use of Ehrlich's Salversan on the grounds that scientific inventions and discoveries are the fruit of a universal and anonymous development. That, however, is utterly impossible when it comes to the question of ethical conceptions borrowed from Judaism and now an integral part of the national religion. Hence the German people find themselves more and more compelled to purge Christianity of all its original elements—a difficult task—or to replace it by a German religion with a mythology and a morality of its own.

The attempt to preserve a Christianity from which all historical Jewish elements and personalities had been eliminated was doomed to failure from the start and led inevitably to the schisms within the Protestant Churches which destroyed their influence, all the more as the leading German statesmen were doing their utmost to found a new State religion. For although supporters of the racial creed have tried to prove that Jesus himself was of Nordic origin, one fact is beyond dispute: all his disciples were Jews and the share they had in the propagation of the Christian faith cannot be denied. They, and in particular St. Paul, may be accused of having distorted the Divine teaching by introducing into it Jewish ideas, but the fact still remains that the Gospels produced and still produce their effect in this so-called falsified version. If Dinter, the apostle of a new faith reconciling the racial creed with Christianity, maintains that Jesus was the first National-Socialist and hence a Nordic chief like Hitler, that does not prevent all Christian Churches from believing in Him according to the conception of Him given by the Gospels, namely as the Saviour who took upon Himself the burden of the Cross for love of mankind and not for the glory of the race.

It is here that National-Socialism differs from the Spanish move-

ment of the fifteenth century with which it nevertheless has many resemblances. In the eyes of the Spaniards the Jews were damned because they had rejected the Christ born in their midst and not on account of their origin. Hence for the Germans there remains only the second way open—namely, that of creating a German faith to oppose to the religious tradition for ever sullied by the Jews: a religious movement which would supersede Christianity throughout the centuries. That is why the Germans see in this campaign against the Jewish spirit, unique in the history of anti-Semitism—and of which the campaign against the economic power of the Jews is a relatively unimportant corollary—the true and positive revolutionising of the spirit, compared with which the merely negative French Revolution is only an insignificant symptom of decline.

For them it is a conflict in which the greatest and highest things in life are at stake. It is a matter of creating a new faith, a new philosophy transforming the life and the world of the individual and giving to all measures adopted against the Jews an inner justification and a religious consecration. It is a fight for the victory of the German racial belief in the purity of Aryan blood and in the inestimable value of the Nordic race and spirit. If this new faith is pregnant with truths which nations, still blind slaves to former errors, cannot yet recognise; if indeed, as its disciples maintain, it alone can save for centuries a world otherwise doomed to destruction; if it displays in all fields of human life creative activity, then the measures adopted against the Jewish spirit and still more against the material existence of the German Jews must be approved as an incidental and unimportant consequence of a world revolution, however regrettable they may be in themselves. Isolated tragedies, even a decline in civilisation and a curtailment of science and culture, could have no value compared with a religious movement which would necessarily involve positive and obvious results in all spheres of human activity.

And that is actually the opinion of German believers. The *Handbook on the Jewish Question* by Theodor Fritsch, of which 150,000 copies have been distributed, and which Hitler recommends

should be in every German household, bears on its cover: "The Jew conquers with falsehood and dies with truth." I must admit that as a foreigner preoccupied with German for nearly a life-time, I had to have this statement translated into German in order to grasp its meaning. For taken literally it would mean that the Jew conquers throughout his life in league with falsehood, but turns to truth at the moment of his death. The thought however, which Fritsch does not actually express but wishes to convey: "The Jew conquers by means of falsehood and dies by truth", does really touch the heart of the question. If the new creed is a new truth capable of completely transforming a decrepit and dying world, then the death of a community whose existence stands in the path of victory of the new gospel is a necessary and justifiable sacrifice. It is therefore essential to study this creed, in particular its political consequences, from a standpoint completely outside of the Jewish question before rejecting it for reasons of sentimentality or resentment. For sentimentality or resentment must necessarily appear trivial compared with a movement which is to rejuvenate the world.

CHAPTER THREE

The New German Faith

The West European who only knows German philosophy from the newspapers, or who has had an opportunity of seeing the discipline displayed at mass demonstrations, receives the definite impression that there can be no question about the unity of German faith. In reality three main religions at least have simultaneously arisen in Germany, religions which differ radically one from the other. Each claims to be the only true religion but they differ more widely, not only in their fundamental tenets but also in the political consequences which necessarily follow from them, than do Christianity and Mohammedanism. And the foreigner who studies more closely the basic works of these new religions cannot but be amazed at the ease with which the German people, and in particular their spiritual and political leaders, disregard for emotional reasons all contradictions.

In any other country such divergent views would lead inevitably and fatally to discussions of principle. In Germany on the other hand the prophets of the three religions—the first of which, that of Hitler, may be called the Aryan; the second preached by the racial “sociologist” Günther, the Nordic; and the third, taught chiefly by Ludwig Ferdinand Clauss, the religion of the soul of the race—live in perfect political and intellectual harmony. If they contradict each other in their writings, they are most anxious—if such an expression is permissible in view of the heroic philosophy of the parties concerned—not to point out the lack of agreement in their views or to call the attention of their disciples to it.

The Aryan creed is most clearly formulated in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

"There is only one supreme law for man," he declares, "and this law is at the same time his most sacred duty: to keep his blood pure in order to preserve for the highest type of man the possibility of a nobler evolution."

His assumption is that there is a homogeneous Aryan race, and that it alone is the representative of human culture.

"As a conqueror the Aryan subdued the lower types of man and then regulated their political activity, according to his will and for his own aims. . . . As long as he ruthlessly maintained the standpoint of the ruler he not only remained in fact the ruler but likewise preserved and fostered culture. For this was based exclusively on his specific abilities and consequently on his supremacy as such. As soon, however, as the vanquished began to raise themselves and, probably by acquiring his language, draw closer to the conqueror, the sharp distinction between master and slave disappeared. The Aryan abandoned the purity of his blood and consequently lost the paradise which he had created for himself. He was engulfed by the intermingling of races and gradually lost more and more his cultural aptitudes, until the day arrived when he resembled more closely, both physically and morally, the vanquished natives than his own ancestors."

From this teaching it follows that there is only one unpardonable crime—that of polluting Aryan blood by inter-mixture with that of natives inferior both in blood and race. This mixture of races, and it alone, is the danger which threatens the world and which has already begun in part to destroy culture. Culture was created, everywhere and always, only by the Aryans, the bearers of light. It is to the best advantage of the other nations, whether they be the early inhabitants of Europe, the Semites, the Mongols or the Negroes, to submit willingly to the Aryan race as its members alone possess the capacities for leadership. The unfortunate mongrels of mixed descent who are consequently lost in outer darkness of the chaos of races must be eliminated from the community in so far as they cannot be utilised as slaves.

It would be a mistake to regard this first German religion, the Aryan faith of Hitler, merely as a personal opinion of the author,

formulated for the purpose of political propaganda during the period of opposition and now of negligible significance for the statesman who has attained power. In March 1933, 250,000 copies of his book had already been issued; to-day the number is at least ten times as high. Not only that: in 1934 an order was given that a copy of the book should be distributed to each member of the Reichswehr which had not yet been "co-ordinated" in all respects. The same must have happened in the case of the thousands of members of the labour camps and of the official organisations of the S.S. (Blackshirt Guards) and S.A. (Storm Battalions). Further, this book is recognised at present as the official catechism of the Aryan religion and given to every couple on the day of their marriage as the sacramental symbol of the new German faith.

Foreign scholars might object that the science of race is inexact—and they have not failed to do so—for the good reason that in reality Aryans and Semites do not exist and that the terms "Aryan" and "Semite" designate languages and not races. English scholars in agreement with the conclusions of an old Austrian ethnologist, recently stated in an official declaration that the terms "Aryan race" and "Semitic race" were as devoid of sense as "dolichocephalic or brachycephalic language". But these objections of foreign science carry absolutely no weight. No religion—and here we are dealing with a religion—has ever been refuted by rational argument. Faith—and the Aryan faith more than any other—cannot abandon its *a priori* judgments and allow the arguments of objective science, for this science is the evil product of liberal convictions born of the chaos of races.

The *Völkischer Beobachter*, the official government paper, formulated the relation of faith to science when the Professor of Old German Law languages at the University of Berlin, the Privy Councillor Behagel, attempted to show that all interpretations of the Germanic words "od" and "odal" were nonsense, interpretations which had grave political consequences in the drafting of the Law of Entail. "We National-Socialists fully recognise science, but we demand that German science should be practised in the German spirit. We also reject idle phantasies and false prophets but we combat

by every means whatever threatens the State." In an official speech the Minister of Justice, Frank, was even more explicit: "Every new scientific theory must ask itself the question 'Do I serve National-Socialism for the greater benefit of all?'" As in the case of every religion, scientific knowledge—and consequently truth—is no longer recognised as of supreme value when it clashes with dogmas intuitively perceived as correct. Scientific objections, and facts established beyond all doubt by science, do not affect the vitality of a faith, which never loses its authority, or even its influence on the feelings of the faithful, should it be proved erroneous.

The opinion of foreign and consequently heretical scholars can never have any value in this connection—only what is decreed by German racial science. For it too has founded a religion, not the Aryan religion, but the Nordic faith. Nevertheless, although arguments advanced by the sceptical science which he denies may be of no importance to the believer, the principles of another religion, born at the same time as his own and considered its ally by him as by the whole world, should have all the more significance for him. On this fundamental point however, the Nordic creed stands in irreconcilable contradiction to the Aryan faith.

Günther, the apostle of the Nordic religion, appointed Professor of "Social Anthropology" in the University of Jena, just before the National-Socialist Revolution, and thus promoted official representative of the new racial science, recently officially recognised again at Nuremberg by being accorded the State prize, declares in his standard work *The Ethnology of the German People* that the terms "Aryan" and "Semite" must be avoided as being non-scientific, for people of very different races speak Aryan or Semitic languages. In another equally well-known work by Günther, *A Study of the European Races*, the term "Aryan" does not appear at all. Günther considers it so unimportant that he does not even protest against its use. He only mentions in connection with the Semitic race, that the Jews could not form part of it seeing that there are only peoples of Semitic tongue, composed of different races, and that there is no such thing as a Semitic race. For the Nordic religion therefore, the historical mythology of the

The New German Faith

Aryan religion can be nothing but a mere fable; for Aryans and non-Aryans are only a product of the imagination due to the succession of errors". It is impossible that culture should be the achievement of the Aryans and that mixing with non-Aryans should have caused them to lose their Paradise.

The Nordic religion, in opposition to the Aryan, considers it absurd to regard the Germans as Aryans. The German people in its view is not composed of one race but of seven: the Nordic, Dinaric, Alpine, East Baltic, Falian, Mediterranean and Sudetan, the Nordic race predominating, as there is in the German nation 50% of Nordic blood, 20% Alpine, 15% Dinaric, 8% East Baltic, 5% Falian and 2% Mediterranean blood, with a little Sudetan and Eurasiatic blood in addition.

This does not mean that half the German nation is composed of individuals of pure or even dominantly Nordic blood. Broadly speaking, intermixture has proceeded so far that the same individual presents characteristics of the most diverse races, and on the average, only about 50% of Nordic features. Hence, pure or dominantly Nordic types are very rare amongst Germans. "It is too high an estimate" says Günther "to reckon the number of Nordics in Germany as one-tenth of the whole population. Germans of pure or dominantly Nordic type represent about 6% to 8% of the German population." Nevertheless—and this point constitutes the fundamental dogma of the Nordic religion in contrast to the Aryan religion—the Nordic race, thanks to its intellectual qualities, and above all to its qualities of leadership, is the most remarkable and the most valuable race in the world: "Degeneration and de-Nordicisation have caused the downfall of all peoples of Indo-Germanic tongue." A logical, pure and productive development of German life is therefore only possible if based on the blood and spirit of the Nordic race. The aim of the Nordic religion is, therefore, not the maintenance of the supremacy of the non-existent Aryans, but Nordicisation and prevention of de-Nordicisation.

The Nordic creed, like the Aryan—and this brings it sharply into conflict with the third German religion, that of the soul of the race—is based on a belief in "blood". It is, so to speak, a physical

faith, not in the sense that certain physical qualities are particularly valuable, but that certain moral qualities are indissolubly linked with physical peculiarities and define the group as a racial entity. For that reason Günther first describes the physical characteristics and then the mental qualities of each race. According to him, a race is "a human group, differentiated from all other groups, constituted on the same basis by physical characteristics and moral qualities which are peculiar to it, the members of which always reproduce their own kind". Hence certain moral qualities occur only in combination with specific physical traits. It is impossible for the soul of a Nordic to be influenced by that of an Alpine or an Armenoid. Given this intimate connection between physical characteristics and moral qualities, how could anyone have Nordic thoughts and sentiments if he did not belong physically to the Nordic race? Alfred Rosenberg, another apostle of the Nordic race, therefore openly asserts: "Soul is race seen from within: and conversely, race is the exterior of a soul." In this creed, the conception of "blood" is identical with that of the Nordic soul: a Nordic soul without Nordic blood is utterly inconceivable.

Very different is the third religion, that of the soul of the race. From the cultural point of view, if not from the political, it seems to predominate in Germany, though it may be a heresy in the eyes of true Germans to separate these two points of view. According to its founder, Clauss, the difference of races lies "not in the appearance of the body, for instance, the colour of the hair, fair or dark; in stocky bodies with dark hair, blond and elegant souls, so to speak, may be found, to which—if we may say so in advance—blond or lithe bodies would be appropriate. The rift goes deeper: it exists between soul and soul, often between a soul and its body. Sometimes it is even to be found within a single soul. Often there is more than one such rift." Here it is the style of life, the soul, which is fundamental and characteristic for the race and which need not by any means harmonise with the physical structure, although it may do so. Physically, therefore, a race would be recognised not so much by anatomical characteristics, such as the length of the skull, or the colour of the hair, as by general demeanour and expression: the body expresses the style

of the soul which varies from one race to another and is thus a distinctive mark of race. The fair skin of the Nordic, for instance is less a characteristic of his physical type than a means by which he can express his spiritual nature. As the Nordic "has a soul which speaks through silence", he must have "a most sensitive and expressive skin capable of reflecting the slightest emotion, for the soul would be dumb if the reactions of the skin did not speak for it". The races, therefore, are primarily defined by the fact that they represent moral types: the Nordic is the spiritual type of the productive man of action, the Mediterranean, of the dramatic type, the Falian, the persevering plodder, the man of the desert is a visionary, the Armenoid belongs to the "saviour" type. Often the types, and therefore, the races, appear in combinations which it is difficult to separate. Thus Clauss gives a picture of a Nordic woman, the lower half of whose face is Nordic, while the upper half has an Alpine smile, and a Moroccan Jew who is undoubtedly of the Armenoid "saviour" type but in whom "a Nordic element gives his face a far-away dreamy look". Hence, "what we call German and what we call Teutonic is not a race but a physical and spiritual structure which arises from the interplay of several races".

Here it is of no importance to decide whether the fundamental beliefs of these three religions are correct or not. It matters little that every believer in the Aryan creed is convinced that the Aryan has always been a leader, even if in one of the decisive battles of European history, that of Châlons, German princes followed the Hun Attila and fought for him; that, according to Günther, the Alpine race, to which the majority of the French belong, has scarcely contributed anything to European civilisation although he himself gives as the type of the Alpine race, Honoré de Balzac—a novelist who far surpasses all Nordic writers of the nineteenth century in courage, imagination and constructive genius; that according to Clauss, Socrates in the Symposium "has been seen by Plato in a Nordic manner because he goes forth at dawn as victor over the power of wine" (as though this did not represent the triumph of the Mediterranean type over intoxication). The important thing in this connection is the changes which have produced these religions in

Germany, how it is possible for them to live in peaceful harmony with one another in spite of their fundamental differences and why they enjoy in Germany—and only in Germany—such wide-spread popularity.

One thing never fails to astonish a foreign observer. Whereas a new creed revolutionises every sphere of a nation's activities, the different German religions—though sharing the fanaticism common to all religious movements—only alter the world by *not* applying their principles in practice. Their ideas live—with the single exception of those on the Jewish problem—only in theory.

According to the Aryan philosophy of Hitler, the most important task ought to be to separate the Aryans most carefully from the inferior natives within the German people. For German culture, like every other, must have arisen by Aryans conquering and occupying the country, giving their laws to the conquered natives and thus creating that paradise from which they could only banish themselves by mixing with the vanquished. As it can scarcely be maintained that the Jews were the inferior natives inhabiting Germany before the invasion of the Teutons, all the laws of the Third Reich, instead of being directed against the Jews, should aim at preventing further intermingling between the descendants of the Aryan conquerors and the inferior natives. Hence the peasants should be examined to see whether they belong to the pure blood of the Aryan conquerors, and those with dark hair, short skulls and of small stature be ruthlessly driven from the soil as descendants of the first inhabitants. Of what use is a Law of Entail if it protects the great-grandchildren of the non-Aryan primitive inhabitants who were formerly serfs and only made free peasants by mistake and by a liberalism lacking all principle? Of what value is the finest passport for a leader if there is a possibility that the ancestors mentioned in this passport perhaps sprang from the seed of the vanquished, so that it is even conceivable that plebeian leaders, descended from inferior native blood, should rule over their Aryan conquerors by pretending to be of Aryan descent? Only because such a separation between the descendants of the Aryans and of the primitive inhabitants, which is the very foundation of this religion,

was not made, was it possible that non-Aryan leaders such as Röhm, Heines or Ernst, could collaborate in the government, with such disastrous consequences for the German people. The Jewish descent of Gregor Strasser, formerly the most influential of the leaders after Hitler, was only discovered by another leader, Herr Streicher, after his execution. It is perhaps fortunate that those killed on the 30th of June betrayed the fact that they did not belong to the Aryan race by their treachery: but who can guarantee that even to-day there are no descendants of the non-Aryan natives who, by intrigue, have obtained leading positions and continue to govern the German people? And what is to prevent the native race, formerly held in subjection but now raised to a footing of equality by liberalism, from polluting the noble Aryan blood by further marriages? "The intermingling of blood, and the consequent decline of the racial level, being" according to Hitler, "the sole cause of the death of every culture", and "every historical event being but the expression of the instinct of self-preservation in the races both in the good and the bad sense", and finally "the foundation and pillars of all human creation coming only from the Aryan"—what are the laws or measures taken by Germany to protect the purity of Aryan blood against the vanquished native races who, according to the historical ideas of Hitler, still exist and are very numerous? Action along these lines is not to be found, but on the contrary in the Aryan religion we have the unique example of a creed which renounces from the very start all attempts at realising its fundamental dogma.

The position is the same as regards the Nordic creed. Seriously to Nordicise or even merely to stop the de-Nordicisation of the German people, measures would have to be taken in order to prevent in future mixtures of Alpine, Dinaric or Mediterranean Germans with the greatly reduced remnants of the pure Nordics. The prohibition of marriages between Germans and Jews achieves little because it merely prevents 1% of the population intermarrying with the remaining 99%. If the 8% to 10% of pure Nordics on whom the whole future of Germany rests are not forbidden to mix with other races and thus to become de-Nordicised, of what use is it that Frennsen, the celebrated author

of *Jörn Uhl*, the most tedious novel in the world, relates, with the approval of Günther, the sad fate of a noble Nordic who marries a plump Alpine and thus ruins his life? Do the laws of Germany prevent this? On the contrary, the misfortune which former governments drew upon Germany, according to the Nordic theory, by permitting members of the worthless Alpine race to acquire land, has now been perpetuated for centuries by means of the present Law of Entail, which guarantees their holdings to these Alpines and their descendants, so disastrous for the race. The only German woman who took the Nordic creed really seriously, according to a report of the Minister Barthels, was the one who, at her training school in the province of Magdeburg-Anhalt, asked to be sterilised "because she had too many Alpine elements".

Are the leaders examined for their degree of Nordicism? When, after a long absence, I returned to Berlin after June 1934, the joke was going the rounds that now one knew what the Nordic man looked like: he had to be as blond as Hitler, as tall as Goebbels and as manly as Röhm. Actually, with the solitary exception of Goering, not one of the present German leaders has pure or even predominantly Nordic characteristics and consequently not one is given in the books on which the Nordic race theory is based as an example of the Nordic type. On the other hand, Luther, Goethe, Freiherr von Stein, Karl Maria von Weber, Schubert, Thoma, Stuck, Schaffer, whom one is accustomed to regard as representatives of the German spirit, are dark-haired and therefore not purely Nordic. Nevertheless nothing is done in the Third Reich to counteract their spiritual influence, although any Nordic ideas they may have had are bound to appear in a degenerate and distorted form in their work. For according to the Nordic theory, it is impossible, because of the unity of body and soul in which the race appears, that Nordic ideas should be able to manifest themselves in people not purely Nordic. And it remains incomprehensible why the leaders of the Social-Democratic trade unions, amongst whom, according to Günther, fair-haired dolicho-cephalics were in a proportion higher than the average, should have been attacked and excluded from the government. What is even more incomprehensible is that these trade

unions were dissolved when they corresponded to the mentality of so many Nordics.

But the Nordic religion renounces any attempt at realising its fundamental dogma not only as regards marriage legislation, and in the choice of its leaders, but even more so in education. If many University professors have been converted to the Nordic faith, that cannot make them Nordic according to their own religion, nor give them the power of Nordicising the youth which is entrusted to their care. If, according to their physique, they are Alpine, Dinaric, Falian, Mediterranean or even Armenoid mongrels, and if nevertheless in spite of it they profess Nordic ideas, they are only, still according to the Nordic view, furthering the moral chaos of the races because they are destroying in the most criminal manner the intimate union between physical characteristics and intellectual qualities which, according to Günther, constitutes the unity of the race. Nordic ideas proclaimed and transmitted to Nordic youth by Alpines: what a blasphemy for a believer in the Nordic creed, worse even than the simultaneous admiration of Christ and Wotan by a Christian! Nevertheless, there has never been any question in Germany of examining professors from the racial standpoint—with the exception of the Jews—in order to establish their abilities to Nordicise. It is sufficient even to-day for an Alpine, a Mediterranean or a de-Nordicised mongrel to profess his faith in words, in order to retain his post.

Who guarantees that Carl Schmitt, the great professor of political law of the Third Reich, is not an Alpino-Armenoid mongrel? Do not the reasons which he made use of to defend the law legitimising all the events preceding the 30th of June 1934, suggest Oriental subtlety? His contention that the individual will of the Führer has the force of law is as anti-Nordic as possible, since for a German of earlier times the law was unchangeable and divine, independent of the will of the individual, and the leader was only the first amongst equals. The theory of Carl Schmitt corresponds much more closely to the religion of the Arabian Caliphs and the Byzantine Emperors. •

Even if by accident it should happen that a professor belongs

to the 6% to 8% of pure Nordics in Germany, his practical influence on the students and his living example are almost nullified by the strange educational policy of the National-Socialists. A German friend, a professor of Germanic languages whose blameless genealogical tree enables him to retain his post at the University, complained to me of the fact that since the revolution his audience was composed chiefly of women and Jews, his students for the most part being engaged in parades, in labour service, or in physical drill, to such an extent that they could no longer seriously attend his lectures. Quite contrary to their intention it is only women and the few Jews still allowed in the Universities who are becoming the sole preservers of Germanic science.

How is it to be explained that in the labour camps and in the schools a Nordic education is given indiscriminately to German youth, all being educated according to a purely Nordic ideal, although they belong to the Alpine, Baltic, Falian, Dinaric or even Asiatic races? That is surely to magnify the error made by former governments: by educating foreign races in a Nordic ideal pseudo-Nordics are trained who, on account of the indispensable agreement between physical and moral characteristics, can only accept these ideals in the most superficial manner and who must inevitably falsify them in their minds, simulating qualities which they do not possess in view of their racial characteristics, but which they are apparently obliged to acquire. The true intellectual de-Nordicisation of the German people exists when Alpines, Mediterraneans, Dinarics and Faliens, Sudetans and Asiatics, are uniformly compelled to think and to speak in the Nordic manner. The result is that in the books and newspapers of pronounced Nordic tendencies, the Nordic idea is maintained by people of another race. This is obvious from the way they maltreat the German language in proclaiming the Nordic ideas. It is impossible to imagine in France a nationalist paper published in the jargon of the *Handbook of the Jewish Question* by Fritsch, or of the National-Socialist paper *Der Stürmer*.

Doubtless these are but the trifling errors of a movement in its infancy and which has centuries still to live. The important thing is, however, that the spiritual leaders of this movement are not Nordics

and that they inculcate into their disciples Nordic ideas without taking any account of the race to which they belong. To be really logical the exponents of the Nordic religion should first endeavour clearly to separate the races within Germany itself in order to eliminate from the rank of leader or of candidate for leadership those Germans having little or no Nordic blood, to educate only the Nordics in the Nordic ideal in order that they command, and that the others occupy in the National organisation the inferior posts appropriate to their race. But, just like the Aryan religion, the Nordic religion draws no political conclusions whatever from its theories, and the intellectual Nordicism of all Germans only increases in practice the spiritual chaos in which the races live.

The third creed has likewise produced no practical effects, although more even than the others it has fired the heart of German youth. In contrast to the two principal religions, that of the soul of the race makes no claim that the Aryan or Nordic race is superior to the others. "Difference of spiritual type" says Clauss very sensibly, "undoubtedly means that different virtues are realised by the one or the other race; it implies a difference in kind and not in degree of virtue. Race A realised the laws of its being according to other standards than race B, by which, however is not meant that these other standards are higher or lower in value". But it is essential for every race that it preserve the peculiarities of its mentality and style of life. The aim of science should therefore be to ascertain the moral qualities characteristic of the Nordic type—the man of action and achievement—and the political goal, to allow each race to live with its own particular style and mentality, "the Nordic man free from foreign ideals, the foreigner free from Nordic ideals". But if one accepts the account which Clauss, the founder of this science and of this religion, gives of the qualities of the Nordic race and the Nordic ideal, on the preservation of which the future of the German people depends, the result is the same as for the other two religions. The National-Socialist Revolution, caused in part by the belief in particular qualities of the Nordic German, has created a style of life which is diametrically opposed to the aim in view.

According to Clauss and his disciples, the Nordic man is solitary, reserved and without great gifts of expression, living only for his work. Constantly, "the German fears to reveal too much and exercises therefore the most severe discipline and the most extreme reserve in expression. The Nordic does not speak only by what he says, but even more by what he does not say. The pauses in his conversation are pregnant with meaning. His most noble means of expression is silence." Loyalty is one of his essential features and "it is based on free choice; the man chooses his leader to whom he willingly submits after having freely chosen him because he has recognised his greatness and superiority. He follows him trusting in his superiority. If he is betrayed he ceases to follow him." Above all freedom of choice is the fundamental characteristic of the Nordic: "To live a model life in the Nordic sense is not to seek applause and to exist only for the gallery (that would be a typical Mediterranean ideal); the model Nordic life is ultimately solitary. The more a man, a family, or a young generation are Nordic and the more education can develop in them Nordic elements, the less such a generation will let itself be compelled or persuaded to follow a given example. Nordic youth chooses in full liberty and must do so. Independence of spirit cannot be developed in lives and simultaneously crushed. A young generation which does not revolt against the models imposed upon it and allows itself to be bound by new dogmas, proves that it is not Nordic." Woman for the Nordic is the equal of man, with full control over her own life and free to choose her life's companion. True Protestantism is Nordic, as is also the self-reliant conscience, the freedom of a Christian which gives to each individual soul its own responsibility. "Every Nordic soul appears in perfect isolation before God; union with God is not community . . . the Nordic does not reveal himself before the crowd nor appear in the market place with his prayer and profession of faith, but retires into the solitude of his chamber. He would feel ashamed to be overheard." If all the characteristics which this German racial science attributes to the Nordic—solitude and reserve, loyalty, free-will, individual religious conscience and the right of woman to decide her own life—do in

fact characterise the Nordic soul and Nordic mode of life, then it is nowhere realised less than in modern Germany. Instead of the voluntary loyalty, supposed to be a characteristic of the Nordic soul, a most rigid discipline prevails throughout the Third Reich. Such discipline may be useful and no less valuable than voluntary loyalty, but it is none the less contrary to it. He who considering his trust betrayed were to attempt in Germany to abandon the Führer, would soon learn in a concentration camp that his decision, while possibly in accordance with the Nordic mode of life as taught by the religion of the spirit of the race, was out of joint with that of modern Germany. The duty of all young German intellectuals to undergo in the labour camps a period of absolute discipline may perhaps be an advantage for the German nation, but its basis is compulsion or a blind enthusiasm rather than voluntary loyalty. The National-Socialists may be admired for having, conscious of their power, got rid of the German Conservatives, their former allies, once the victory had been obtained and describing this as statecraft; it is difficult however to find in such a proceeding an example of Nordic loyalty. All Germans did not remain as faithful to the Führer as Herr von Papen, who, in spite of the execution of both his secretaries, displayed an exemplary devotion: the list of traitors of June 30th proves to what an extent he had been abandoned by others. When the Students' Association exclude from their organisations, on orders from above, the old gentleman to whom they had formerly sworn fidelity, but who may not completely fulfil the racial ideal, it may be an example of the most perfect discipline and therefore, from the standpoint of a State which places discipline above loyalty, of the highest virtue; but to abandon loyalty for the sake of discipline, is that a manifestation of the freedom of choice characteristic of Nordic youth? June 30th was doubtless a sad necessity: still, neither the conspirators who, until their death, were amongst the leaders of the Third Reich, nor their enemy-friends, whom they helped to power and who executed them, represent the Nordic mode of life, but rather that of the visionary type who feel themselves justified in destroying all human relationships on a mere suspicion, for the sake of an idea. It is natural and comprehensible

that all criticism of the leaders should be forbidden during a transition period, but none the less quite incompatible with the principle of free comradeship and the critical loyalty of a follower. Discipline, authority and obedience may be as valuable as voluntary loyalty, but they are certainly not Nordic in the sense understood by the religion of the spirit of the race.

Where does one find in Germany the solitude of the Nordic soul, its reserve and its silence? Spoken choruses are effective and help to establish communion amongst the people, they are a symbol of uncritical discipline and of the belief in the power of collective speech and action, but they are not a symbol of the solitary reserve of the Nordic soul which requires a certain distance between itself and others and which is most active in solitude. The oratorical ability which enables the Führer of the Germans to hold in Nuremberg on seven consecutive days seven speeches lasting for hours, corresponds to the needs of a great part of the German people, but not to that mode of life which speaks and acts through silence. The mass parades, the perpetual festivals, the existence of a Ministry of Propaganda, with an annual budget of several hundreds of millions of marks, in order to influence each single solitary soul from above, tend to realise an ideal of uniformity which is the same as that in Russia. To call it Nordic would be to transform the religion of the Nordic soul into its contrary. And the Führer denies it rather than helps it towards victory when he writes that already in his youth he was "indignant at the fact that the German Reichstag prevented Wilhelm II from speaking", whereas everybody until now was convinced that this monarch was one of the greatest chatters of history and that a great part of the tension leading to the War was due to his love of speeches. In the Third Reich it is the word which is supreme and not silence. Objectively it may be that the word is more important, but to call it Nordic as understood by the religion of the spirit of race would be rank heresy.

As for the situation of woman in the Third Reich, it is an open question whether she should obey the Führer and the racial idea of the State in her love relationships or whether she should have the right to choose her companion freely. But if the second alter-

native corresponds to the Nordic ideal, it is the first which is realised in Germany. The following story, in no way exceptional, is instructive as to the liberty a woman has in the choice of her companion. "A young German girl, with her hair shaved off, was led under a guard of six armed soldiers through the streets of Nuremberg and dragged through the night clubs with a card round her neck on which hung the tresses which had been cut off and which bore the words, 'I gave myself to a Jew.' Slender, delicate, extremely pretty in spite of her baldness, she was led from one international hotel to another. Several times she slipped, was dragged to her feet by the soldiers and then raised aloft by them so that those farther away could see her. She was then jeered at and roughly handled by the public, who tried to get her to make a speech." At Beuthen, not at the beginning of the National-Socialist Revolution, but in July 1935, "a large number of S.A. men entered a hairdresser's and assaulted the manicurist, Fräulein Lotte Feingräber. National-Socialists shaved the unfortunate girl, covered her head with tar and then wrote in flaming colours on her head the words 'Jewish cocotte'. Afterwards the S.A. men dragged the girl through the streets of the town to put her in the pillory, as she was about to marry a Jew called Posner." This incident, unlike many others of the same type, became known, because the victim was a Pole, which enabled her to lodge a complaint. Posters appear in Germany such as the following: "If she is seen again with the Jew she will be branded. We call upon all Germans conscious of their race to keep watch on Christian women who sell themselves to Jews, to give us their address and that of the Jews in question, and an outline of the case." "Any girl of Aryan blood has only to be caught in the company of a Jew and such a creature, so forgetful of her race, will run a grave risk of being shorn like a whore and exhibited as a warning in the streets." It is possible that such things are all very necessary in modern Germany, but it is none the less true that they somewhat hamper the German woman in the free choice of her companion, which according to the Nordic creed, is the supreme event in her life.

Christian liberty of conscience, responsible only to itself, is

praised as Nordic. Nevertheless the German State Church destroys the freedom of the Protestant parish, dismisses freely nominated bishops and pastors, replaces the collaboration of the parish by the authority of a central administrator or a State bishop, and considers all forms of intellectual criticism as revolt. The Nordic idea can therefore only be a living force among its opponents, who remain faithful to their bishops and pastors in spite of all dangers, trusting solely in God.

It is not even certain that in modern Germany the Nordic soul is creating its own "mode of life" without the help of foreign models, seeing that so few fundamental laws have appeared since the National-Socialist Revolution. Privy Councillor Sering, entirely beyond suspicion as regards his political views and his descent, and still Professor of Agricultural Science at the University of Berlin, gives it as his opinion of one of them, the Law of Entail (which according to its authors is the one most in harmony with the true Nordic-German spirit) that by making proletarians of the younger brothers and sisters and destroying the community of peasant labour, it is typically anti-German, and, instead of being in the best German tradition of a development lasting a thousand years and being an advance towards the millennium, tends to introduce into Germany the principles of entail of the Spanish nobility. The systematic non-payment of commercial debts is likewise not in the Nordic tradition: a Hjalmar Schacht of the ancient Germans would rather have sold his arms to pay his debts than leave them unpaid to buy arms.

The Nordic soul, such as Clauss describes it, has less chance than ever of developing in modern Germany. Amongst the leaders many do not seem to be particularly Nordic, if only because they have been promoted on account of their speeches and not their actions. Nordic life has not flourished in Germany, it has decayed. Absolute discipline instead of voluntary loyalty, compulsory attachment to the soil instead of free love of it, adoration of the Führer instead of frank and critical comradeship, brilliant parades instead of silent work, eloquent discourses instead of silent reflection, 'speaking' choirs instead of solitary meditation, unification of the Churches

instead of Christian liberty, the branding of women who dare to choose their companion freely—all this may be favourable or harmful to Germany and its people, but it certainly is not Nordic. The Germans have altered their national character in many other ways, but not in the one respect that for them theory and practice, belief and action have always been and still are poles apart.

It is true that the National-Socialist Revolution has brought about in Germany important political changes of the Constitution whose objective value or subjective necessity need not be discussed here: dictatorship in the Church as well as in the State, authoritarian domination of public opinion, militarisation of the whole nation, the organisation of German youth, the Law of Entail, State control of love, a directed economy. But all this has nothing to do with the faith that sanctifies such deeds, with Aryan cultural principles, with the Nordicism of the German people and the mentality of the Nordic man of action. It corresponds rather to opposite racial and cultural ideals. The German mentality produces no Nordic deeds and German deeds do not derive from a Nordic mentality.

There is one point, however, on which all three religions agree—the war against the Jews. In this connection they all develop practical activity. The Aryan religion excludes non-Aryans even from such important social posts as require no such protection, thanks to the preference the Germans themselves have for them—for instance, by preventing Jews from acquiring farms and becoming farmers—and the Nordic religion only opposes foreign intellectual influences when they are Jewish. Liberal, Socialist or Communist books written by Nordics, Alpines or Mediterraneans are also put on the index, burnt or buried in libraries: such is the fate of the writings of Engels, Marx's Aryan collaborator, and those of the greatest Bavarian writer, Oscar Maria Graf. But only Jewish books are put on the index whatever their subject, simply because their authors are Jews, so that in the *German Review of Jurisprudence* no account of Jewish works may appear and no Jewish book be advertised, and at the burning of the books in May 1933, even the translations of the work of the non-German Jew Schalom Asch were also burned, although they had absolutely nothing to do with National-Socialist

ideas, Germany or racial questions. Similarly, certain provinces celebrate the expulsion of the Jews by public festivals as if the fact of preventing the Nordics from mingling with 1% of the population was sufficient to preserve the Aryan paradise, perpetually threatened and to a much higher degree by the inferior race of primitive inhabitants. Jews still continue to be excluded from intellectual careers—indeed the measures tend to become more stringent—while Alpine Germans are allowed to poison the minds of the Nordics, and the hatred of the Jews still grows in spite of the fact that 200,000 of them have been forced to emigrate, and Jews have been removed from all influential posts. A decree was issued forbidding the affiliation of the Association of the Jews blinded in the War with the State organisation of War-blinded soldiers. One and a half years after the National-Socialist Revolution another decree established that to enter the S.A. or to matriculate at the University it was not sufficient to have Christian grandparents, but purity of blood must be proved as far back as 1800. The more the Jews decline in number and influence in Germany, the more all the misfortunes which come upon the nation are attributed to them. The National-Socialist press maintained in all seriousness that the conspiracy of Röhm and his allies, whether fictitious or real, had been financed by Jewish capital. The situation begins to justify the story told in May 1933. A little community without Jews had received, like all others, an order to boycott Jewish shops. Whereupon the mayor telegraphed to Berlin: "Please send some Jews otherwise boycott impossible." If the number and influence of Jews continues to decline in Germany the practical activity of the three German religions will cease for want of any real objective.

Otherwise the fundamental dogmas of these religions have only the vaguest connection with anti-Semitism as a political aim. If in *Mein Kampf* Hitler explained in eighteen long pages the philosophy of Aryan history according to which all culture is born and persists solely in virtue of the preservation of the purity of the race, it is natural to expect that a description of the victory of the Aryans over the primitive peoples would follow. Instead we have an account of the Jewish character and its parasitism, in another

eighteen pages. German history is suddenly no longer a struggle against non-Aryan natives, but a triumphal march of the Jews against the Germans interrupted by National-Socialism: "The German princes are to blame that the German nation was unable to liberate itself completely from the Jewish danger. Unfortunately they persisted in their error and the Jew repaid them a thousandfold for the sins which they had formerly committed against their people. They made an alliance with the devil and finished in his power." It is therefore the Jew and not the native non-Aryan who plays the part of the devil consigning to hell the Aryan angel, and it is against him—and surprisingly enough against him alone—that the war of liberation of the German people is directed, there being no question, either in the books or in the practice of the Aryan religion, of taking measures against the primitive natives despite their much greater number.

Still more remarkable is the leap which the racial theory of the Nordic religion has to make in order to justify its practical measures against the Jews. According to the Aryan religion, "the Jew is the diametrical opposite of the Aryan", but the Nordic religion does not share this view. For it the Jews are not a homogeneous race—the Oriental Jews are very different racially from the Mediterranean Jews—and do not differ in every respect from the Aryans and the Nordics. "The southern Jews are an Oriental-Armenoid-Mediterranean-Hamito-Nordic-Negroid mixture with an Oriental dominant, while the Oriental Jews are an Armenoid-Oriental-East Baltic-Asiatic-Nordic-Hamito-Negroid mixture with a certain predominance of the Armenoid element." Many outstanding German Jews possessed Nordic characteristics, such as Eduard von Simson, the first President of the German Reichstag, and Lassalle, both of whom are described as being of the Armenoid-Nordic type. Nevertheless, "the impression of a Jewish race" persists and the Nordic religion therefore comes to a conclusion unjustifiable according to the science of race alone: "The influence of the Jewish spirit, a result of the economic preponderance of the race, is the greatest danger to the life of the nations in Europe and America." Here the

idea of the nation, till then relatively insignificant, is suddenly substituted for that of race, usually much more important. This statement of Günther flatly contradicts his other racial views, all the more as in his *Study of the Jewish Race* he produces without comment the investigations of Gisela Lampertowa, according to which out of seventy-five Jewish students of Lvov, three belonged to the Nordic type and seventeen to the sub-Nordic type, that is to say, more than a quarter, or little less than one would have found in an inquiry amongst German students. As for the third religion, that of the spirit of the race, although knowing "Jews in whom a far-away, dreamy trait suggests a Nordic character", it also agrees on this point with the Nordic creed and considers the influence of the Jewish spirit on the Nordic mode of life extremely dangerous.

To-day Germany recognises officially that the German doctrine of race has as its sole and exclusive content the struggle against the Jewish race and spirit. The Prussian State Councillor Grohé said in an official speech to the youth of Germany that "all races should be considered equal, with the exception of the Jewish race: the Jew must die in order that the nations which received them may live". Indeed, the contention that the struggle against the influence of other races, and in particular against those of the vanquished natives, is superfluous and that only the Jews have to be combated as inferiors has now become law in view of the interpretation of one of the most important new laws. When a Polish peasant, that is a man of Alpine or Armenoid race, protested against becoming a farmer bound by the Law of Entail (probably fearing like many Nordic peasants that he would no longer be able to obtain credit because, bound to the soil, he would not be able to sell his property) the Estate Court in Selle inscribed him on the list of entailed farmers in spite of his protest, on the grounds that according to the law only Jews and coloured men were of inferior race, but that on the contrary "all those people who in the course of history inhabited Europe in colonies" were the racial equals of the German, that is to say, not only the Poles and the Russians, but the Turks also.

In all other countries throughout the centuries anti-Semitism was an incidental and relatively unimportant consequence of the pre-

dominant religious ideas or political systems which modified even more profoundly in other fields the course of events. Catholic Universalism about 1100, led, it is true, to persecutions of the Jews, but these did not dominate the spiritual thought of the period in comparison with the dispute about investitures or with the Crusades, but were incidental consequences of a deep spiritual movement affecting all spheres of life. The Romans of the time of Augustus and his successors hated the isolation of the Jews as opposed to their Imperialist conceptions. But in the totality of the political system of later antiquity, it was only a trifling thorn in the flesh. Czarism favoured pogroms against the Jews, but its historical function was not limited to the fight against the Jews: the belief in the omnipotence of the Czar fostered by pan-Slavonic mysticism simply could not allow the existence of customs forming an obstacle to the spiritual unity of Russia and that obstacle was by no means the worst or the most execrated. In modern Germany, on the other hand, all internal political measures are not derived from the spirit of the three racial religions but are actually opposed to it, except as regards the measures against the Jews. Anti-Semitism in Germany is not a matter of secondary importance, it constitutes the only real political objective. German faith and the hatred of the Jew are one and the same thing, and the three German religions only develop their living power in this contempt for the Jews. Only thus can the mystery be solved why neither the world nor the Germans themselves pay any attention to the differences between these creeds and see in the racial ideas only the peculiar daydreams of a great nation, unimportant in practice except in so far as they produce common effects in their hatred of the Jew.

For these day-dreams are as remote from reality as the hatred of the Jews is real. They take the form for instance of a sanctuary in Lower Saxony, "Steding's Honour", in whose foundation stone, beside Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and Rosenberg's *Myth of the 20th Century*, a document was deposited containing a reference "to the firm determination to keep for ever alive within the German people the blood bond between them and the old Steding warriors who fought for the liberation of Germany". The monument is erected

to the memory of the peasants of Steding who, 700 years earlier, were wiped out in a long struggle with the Archbishop of Bremen. But the conquerors of these peasants were likewise Germans, and Germans who, as they were not killed but could continue to propagate, were much more likely to be the ancestors of the participants in the ceremony than the vanquished. It is undoubtedly edifying that the probable descendants of the victorious Germans honour the memory of the Nordics whom their ancestors slaughtered and with whom they could not possibly have any blood-bond seeing they had been exterminated, but it would be almost the same as if the Greeks had commemorated the Persians who fell at Marathon. Similarly, Charlemagne is called in modern Germany Charles the Butcher, because of his slaughter of the Saxons, although the Germans who fought on the side of the said butcher have greater chances of being the ancestors of the present National-Socialists than the Saxons who were killed. Strange ancestral cult which glorifies their ancestors as butchers and commemorates their adversaries as martyrs. Such a religion, devoid of all historical support, can only manifest itself in Sunday ceremonies. How is it possible to compel more than nine-tenths of the German population, non-Nordics and "mongrels", according to the racial creed, to adopt, in opposition to the spirit and blood of their ancestors, the ideal of the 6% of Nordics who, still according to the blood myth, are bound to remain for ever strangers to them? The German religions, therefore, are in practice nothing but worthless daydreams, except in so far as the struggle against the Jewish spirit is concerned. This is a fact which deserves closer examination.

How is the birth of a faith to be explained which inspires the majority of a nation of 80,000,000 inhabitants and which, though theoretically based on the extraordinary aptitude of its representatives to be the leaders of the world, has as its only content in practice the struggle against a race which does not even constitute the hundredth part of the race of German masters?

To discuss the objective truth of this creed is of no interest, and it is of more value to ask how this religion—a religion which always measures the superiority of the German and the dangers which

threaten him in terms of the Jew—could arise in Germany and attain such power that anti-Semitism, and it alone, has not only become the innermost faith of the ruling Germans but alone can register successes in internal affairs in this field. It is probable that the great strength of this faith springs as much from the peculiar character of its representatives as from that of its object. The state of mind of the German nation had apparently to produce this somewhat uniform religion and is largely satisfied by it, and the object of the religion, the German-Jewish fraction, must obviously be peculiarly suitable to be used as its negative symbol despite its small numbers. The account of the contents and the effects of German racial belief, which was to have answered the question whether the measures against the Jews were justified by the richness of the religion, has come to such unexpected results that the question appears utterly senseless and raises another point. As the new religion only draws its strength from its hostile attitude to the Jews it is clear that the religion was not the cause and the hatred of the Jews the consequence, but conversely the hatred of the Jews the cause and the racial creed the consequence. That is why the head of the foreign press bureau of the National-Social party, Hanfstaengl, in an official declaration destined for foreign nations at the Nuremberg Congress of 1934, declared "The racial principles were only the embodiment of the experiences made by the world with the Jewish problem for the last three thousand years." Hence if it did not exist the racial creed would lose all significance even according to the opinion of the National-Socialist leaders. It would be difficult for a West European, however interested in the Jewish question, to come to consider it as the fundamental problem of his religion, but those who have lived in Germany since the revolution could not fail to notice from the speeches of the leaders and the writings of racial scientists, from daily conversations in the restaurants, in the cafés and even in the family, that not only had the Jewish question become for the Germans a monomania, but that it even increased their national feeling by enabling them to say that, thank God, they were not Jews.

As the racial creed is but the product of Jewish hatred without

influence in other spheres, the question of the value and the productivity of that religion has to be replaced by the very different one as to why it was possible for the hatred of the Jews to produce in Germany a racial conception of the world.

The idea of race and the formulation of a definite racial ideal seem to exercise a great fascination on Germans in consequence of psychological conditions peculiar to them, for otherwise they would have made use of one of the stock reasons for combating Jewish influence. On the other hand, it is probable that the German Jews have or had psychological qualities which enable them to appear as the diametrical opposite of the German racial ideal. What mental qualities explain why the hatred of the Jews constitutes the heart of German political thought, why a great part of the German community accepted the racial creed and created a definite ideal of race, and what qualities of the German Jew qualified them to become the antithesis of this ideal? To reply to these questions the ideas of race and nations must first be defined and an explanation must be sought why to-day the Germans place too high a value on the one and the Jews too high a value on the other.

CHAPTER FOUR

The German Nation and the Jewish Race

The terms "nation" and "race" are used in scientific work and still more in everyday speech with varying meanings. This makes it necessary to state in what sense they will be used in this book as to-day there is only agreement on the one point that the two conceptions do not coincide. Even German racial science admits—and here it is at one with foreign scientists—that a nation may consist and usually does consist of various races, and that, conversely, the same race may be found within different nations. Modern usage, however, particularly with regard to race, is loose and inexact and gives rise to frequent misunderstandings.

The fundamental distinction between the two terms "race" and "nation" is briefly that differences of race are based on physical characteristics, differences of nation on intellectual qualities. Without certain common physical characteristics, such as the colour of the skin, the type of hair, the shape of the skull, the formation of the eyes, unity of race is inconceivable; similarly, without certain common mental characteristics, usually language or cultural habits, there is no nation. It is possible, though by no means certain, that corresponding to the physical characteristics of race there are specific intellectual qualities and that physical differences are associated with national mentality. But the intellectual characteristics of a race are most intangible and as difficult to establish as the physical characteristics of a nation. The description of a race will therefore always have to start from its physical peculiarities, while that of a nation will begin with its mental ones. "La langue," says Pittard, "est un fait social, la race est un fait zoologique."

A nation exists when a human community has a uniform

language, a social organisation, a common culture and historical memories, and somewhere in the world a common territory which it loves as its home country. Occasionally one of these elements may be lacking without causing the group to lose its character as a nation, but only if one or more of the other elements is particularly strong. Thus, a common language is generally the most important national element: nevertheless, the Swiss may be called a nation because they are so strongly bound to one another by common historical memories, and their culture for centuries past has been so characteristic in consequence of the natural and political limits of their territory, that, in spite of their four languages, they constitute a united whole sharply divided off from the surrounding peoples. The same is true of the Dutch. Until quite recently, they spoke almost the same language as their neighbours, the Low Germans, although they had long been an independent nation. Conversely, a common historical past is not an essential condition for belonging to a nation, if the language spoken is the same: an Alsatian Frenchman or a Transylvanian Saxon lack to a great extent common historical memories with their mother nation, but the common language and the feeling of belonging to the same culture is so strong that the one considers himself French, the other German. It is true that frequently a common language is not sufficient to weld two communities into a nation if the differences in historical memories and culture, especially in the most important cultural element, religion, is too great. The difficulty of forming a Yugo-Slav nation by uniting the Croats and the Serbs, both of whom speak the same language but are separated by a different history, culture and religion, as shown first by the assassination of the leader of the Croats, Stefan Radic, and then of King Alexander, proves how little the same language and a common territory is able to replace the lack of the other elements.

The importance of social organisation as a characteristic of a nation must neither be exaggerated nor underestimated. There were and are nations in which certain social categories are completely or almost completely lacking, whether it be that they are able to do without these classes, indispensable to other nations, or

that groups of foreigners take over the necessary function of such classes. Thus, in the Roman Empire there was for many centuries no real warrior class: it was replaced by the warriors of others nations, amongst whom the Illyrians and the Teutons played the chief part. Modern England has no peasantry of major importance, while Ireland, on the other hand, has no class of great landowners. In Turkey commerce was carried on mainly by foreigners, for the most part Armenians, Greeks and Jews, whereas a Turkish merchant was a rarity. Although the absence of an important class does not always point to disease in a nation, the fact that certain groups are over-developed, while others are lacking, is frequently an indication that a national community is either in process of formation or has already begun to disintegrate. This fact is of particular importance in considering the question of Jewish nationality in Central Europe.

From the present definition of a nation it follows that the German Jews do not belong to the Jewish nation, even if such should exist in the Near East or in Palestine. They are not united either by language or territory, and the common bonds of historical memories, of religion and with it of a common culture, have become so feeble since the emancipation that they alone are insufficient to maintain the unity necessary for a nation.

The historical memories of the Jews belong to a period which ended some two thousand years ago, and since then the fate of the various Jewish groups has been very different, and so have their memories. Moreover, the Jewish faith is no longer a living force in by far the great majority of German Jews. The birth certificate of a Jew might perhaps prove his race, if there is a Jewish race, but never his nationality. If this were not so, the orthodox Jews ought to exert an influence which they by no means possess at the present time, as is shown by the elections in the autonomous Jewish organisations. Even in Vienna, in which the Eastern orthodox Jews were relatively strongest as compared with other German-speaking countries, they did not put forward a separate list of candidates at the last elections, and their importance in all other German towns is still much less.

The German Jews are also conspicuously lacking in social organisation and division into classes. Whereas in Poland, Russia and Czecho-Slovakia at least 10% of the Jews are engaged in agriculture—in Carpathian Russia even more than 27%—there are practically no Jewish farmers or big landowners in Germany. They only constitute 1.4% of the Jewish population, while on the other hand in 1907 55% of the German Jews were engaged in commerce or in banking. Whatever the reason for this strange disproportion, whether it was the unwillingness of Germans to tolerate Jews in agriculture (in most of the German states Jews were long forbidden to buy land and in Austria this prohibition was in force until 1868) or a dislike on the part of the Jews for agriculture, which certainly does not appear in other countries, together with a pronounced liking for commerce, the fact remains that one of the important if not fundamental elements of a nation, the organisation into classes, was never able to develop there.

Moreover, until quite recently it was considered doubtful whether the Jews outside of Germany, and in particular the Jews in Poland and Russia, where still more than half of all Jews live, could be regarded as a nation. It is true that two elements of a nation are present there—a common language and a closed colony. But until just before the War Yiddish was only a German dialect. A Yiddish literature of any standing has only existed for a few decades and until recently had no greater cultural significance than writings in local French or German dialects, such as Low German or Provençal.

It is true they had a common territory, but until the end of the World War this was not one voluntarily accepted, but imposed on them by the ghetto policy of the countries in which they lived. Compulsion rather than love had made a home of it, as is shown by the large number of emigrants. And the last element of nationality was just as divided: the historical memories of the Jews in Poland and Russia were a strange mixture of adaptation to the force of surrounding circumstance and of clinging to Hebrew traditions, the former dominating everyday life, the latter the religious holidays. Even to-day the situation in orthodox circles

in Poland is as Heine described it a hundred years ago, namely, that for six days of the week the Jew adapts himself to the surrounding world in a hard struggle for his daily bread, whereas from Friday evening on he feels himself as the chosen but ill-fated prince of a magnificent but vanished kingdom.

Formerly the orthodox Jew in Poland and Russia did not consider himself as belonging to any nation, neither to that of his adopted country nor to the Jewish; for him, who lived only in his religion as far as he lived intellectually at all, the nation until a few years ago was something quite unreal. The Jew belonged to the Jewish religion and it held such an important place in his life that he had no need of anything else to distinguish him from his environment. At present an attempt is being made in Palestine to create once more a Jewish nation. There a common territory, a common neo-Hebraic language and an articulated social organisation exists in reality. Common historical memories are still lacking, in so far as they go back less than nineteen hundred years, and there is likewise no common culture yet, but on the other hand the consciousness of a similar past of sufferings replaced in part the historical continuity lacking. At present, however, the Palestine Jews constitute only 3% of the Jews, less than half the number of German Jews in 1930, and only a fourth of the Jews in New York. For the moment the only real influence of Palestine is to make it possible for a part of the Jewish community to cherish the dream of becoming an independent nation in future.

The fact that the German Jews do not belong to a *Jewish* nation does not imply, however, that they must be regarded as members of the *German* nation. Just as there are to-day stateless people, it is possible that the German Jews should have become "nation-less" by detaching themselves from the Jewish community without being accepted by the Germans. This would happen in so far as they shared with the Germans a common language and common territory but not the historical memories or the culture.

A considerable number of German Jews, however, have been established in Germany for hundreds of years and have in part suffered the fate of the German nation, in part influenced it, so that

to a large extent they share common historical memories with the Germans. For although their destiny was different from that of the German nobility or the German middle class, this difference was not much greater than that of the main German classes, nobility, middle class and peasant, amongst themselves. Just as the German peasants were not excluded from the German people because, after the loss of the German Peasant War and under the influence of Slavonic thought and Roman law, they became bound to the soil and had a different fate from that of their conquerors, so likewise the occasional Jewish persecutions have never resulted in making the German Jews feel that they were excluded from the German nation. Even the Eastern immigrants were originally German Jews who, emigrating first to the east and later returning to Germany, never abandoned German culture and the German language. They never submitted to the influence of the Slavonic culture which surrounded them for centuries, but clung fast to Yiddish, to this old-fashioned and degenerate but still German dialect, and through the language to German culture. For most German Jews, therefore, all the conditions of belonging to the German nation are fulfilled.

Heine, Börne, Lassalle, Felix Mendelsohn, Mahler, Liebermann, Ehrlich, Freud, Heinrich Hertz, Robert von Lieben, Einstein, to name only stars of the first magnitude amongst poets, musicians, painters and scientists, may be considered as alien, non-Aryan or anti-Nordic, but this does not prevent their belonging, not to the Nordic race, but to the German nation, just as much as the descendants of the Poles and Wends in Prussia, Germanised only a few centuries ago. The German Jews are members of the German nation whether they themselves desire it or not. For neither the wish of the community nor that of the single individual can alter the given fact of belonging to a nation. Even emigration or expulsion only means exclusion from the nation for the descendants of those affected, not for themselves: one belongs to a national community not in virtue of one's own decision or that of other people, but by education and its permanent influence. Hence, one may have black Frenchmen and coloured Englishmen if their edu-

cation, culture and language have made them members of the national community, and for the same reason the great majority of the German Jews unquestionably belong to the German nation.

It is true that a change of nationality is possible even for the individual under certain circumstances, whereas a change of race is not. A French child sent to Germany in its infancy will naturally feel itself as belonging to the German nation and will be reckoned to it, if it has been completely withdrawn from the influence of its French parents, relatives and teachers and brought up in German surroundings. It is well known that, in the former Austrian Empire, the most radical pan-Germans in Bohemia had frequently Czech names and came originally from Czech families, whereas conversely some of the Czechs who were the most bitter opponents of the Germans, bore German names. The princes Schwarzenberg, the Counts Thun, the historian Rieger, were Czech nationalists. On the other hand, the head of the German-Socialists in Czecho-Slovakia to-day is called Czech. As it is above all the language spoken from childhood, and the culture transmitted through it and education, which constitutes nationality, the individual can pass easily from one nation to another as long as he is only at the beginning of his linguistic and cultural education. It may even happen in the case of people of special talent that they change their nationality at a later stage, if they are able to adapt themselves easily or belong to a race with a great power of assimilation, or—a less common case—if their whole energy is devoted to passing from the one nation to the other, as, for instance, the national German hero, Eugene de Savoie, the German poet of French origin, Adelbert de Chamisso, the English Pole Joseph Conrad, and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the English pan-German.

Hence, there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that Jewish families frequently change their nationality and that in a family with wide ramifications are to be found Hungarian and French chauvinists, fanatical pan-Germans and arrogant Englishmen. All that is necessary is that the various cousins should have been subjected at an early age to the influence of one or the other nation. This changing of nationality is only conspicuous in the case of the

Jews and gained for them the reputation of instability, because—in contrast to Christian middle-class or peasant emigrants—they continue to attract attention on account of their religion and their special customs. This makes it easier for their development to be followed. Besides, the strength of family ties, so marked among the Jews, makes the difference of nationality between close relatives stand out all the more. But there is nothing extraordinary in the phenomenon, and it provides no argument against the sincerity of the national feeling and the loyalty of the individual. The higher nobility of Europe and, above all, the royal dynasties related in a similar way and who, for obviously different reasons, change their nationality more frequently than the other classes of the population, show a similar development. The descendants of George III of Hanover, who never knew English, became 100% English gentlemen; those of Napoleon the Corsican, French nationalists, those of the German Habsburgs in Spain the embodiment of Spanish nationalism, without doubts being raised as to the sincerity of their patriotism. Thus it is not changes of nationality amongst the Jews in the course of several generations which is astonishing, but the fact that within any single generation the proportion of emigrants is higher than that of the people with whom they live. That is a special problem which is to be explained by the social conditions, the hostility of the environment, or by the characteristics of many Jews which impels them to occupy leading positions left vacant. The national feeling of the individual is not affected by it in any way.

It is not so easy to decide to what race the Jews belong, all the more as the experts themselves are even less in agreement as to what constitutes a race than a nation. The learned controversies concerning long heads and short heads, square skulls and round, about hair-form and hair-colour as racial characteristics, on the existence or non-existence of races such as the Dinaric—on which German ethnologists making use of the same methods are not agreed—have confused rather than clarified the issue. Thus, since the introduction of skull measurement, the form of the skull has been considered one of the most invariable and distinctive signs of race,

allowing individuals and their descendants to be classed with objective certainty amongst the dolicho-cephalics, brachy-cephalics or meso-cephalics. But this principle has been shaken since the publication in 1910 by the American Dillingham of his *Changes in the Bodily Form of Immigrants*, in which he shows, supported by the investigations of Boas, that children born in America of brachy-cephalic Polish-Jewish parents or of dolicho-cephalic Sicilians had all meso-cephalic skulls, both approaching the cephalic index 80, characteristic of the North American.

About the same time (1905 and 1911) the German Walcher attempted to prove in two works, by means of interesting data, that the position of the head of infants when in bed tended to influence permanently the form of the skull. If the child is constantly laid on its back its head becomes round, whereas lying on its side lengthens the head. The Leipsic gynaecologist, Kruse, confirmed this view with certain reservations in *The German Review of Medicine* in 1934, modifying it to the effect that soft pillows tended to produce round heads while hard pillows made the heads long. Techet, a witty critic of the over-hasty deductions of racial science, pointed out that consequently a child, which as a dolicho-cephalic North European is, according to the racial theory, destined to belong to the long-headed race of rulers, may be transformed into a round-headed believer in authority by being kept on his back. Thus, he says, "a badly-arranged binder decides the human value and destiny of a man".

The same is true for the invariability of other physical characteristics and of the possibility of distinguishing one white race from another by means of them. It is true that many such characteristics are given, especially by German scientists: height, colour of the hair and eyes, slimness, shape of the cheek bones and others. But so far no proof has been given that these characteristics are not liable to be influenced by environment and are entirely dependent on race. Indeed there are many arguments against this thesis. Thus it is established that children of Polish Jews and Italians who have immigrated to the United States are not only taller than their parents, from the very first generation, but that, speaking generally,

all varieties of the white race have increased their height since the beginning of the Middle Ages, apparently as a result of better living conditions. The armour of the early Middle Ages, as a careful observer has pointed out, seems to be made for youths, not for fully developed men. And if it be true that in our own day the races inhabiting Northern Europe and England, as well as their descendants in the United States, are taller on the average than the peoples of the East and South of Europe, it still cannot be determined whether and to what extent this is a consequence of climate and environmental factors or of peculiarities of race.

As regards hair-colour, another characteristic frequently invoked, the Northern races undoubtedly are characterised by a majority of blonds. There are also fair-haired Jews in a fairly large proportion. According to Levi quoted by Günther, there are from 12% to 25% of blond and red-haired Jews in North West Europe, about 25½% amongst Galician Jews, 15% amongst Baltic Jews, from 7.5% to 11.8% amongst Italian Jews, from 6% to 12% amongst the Jews of Southern Europe and about 7% amongst the Turks and even according to another author about 6% amongst the Jews of North Africa. Contrary to the hypothesis of a mixture of race, blond Jews, according to Virchow, are more numerous amongst dark-haired populations. It must not, however, be forgotten that—probably on account of the differences in the method of classification—the conclusions of serious ethnologists differ considerably. Jacobs found 25% of blonds amongst London Jews, whereas Bedoc only found 3.5%. Majer and Kopernicki in one of their works found 23½% of blonds in Galicia, but in a second work only 14.5%. Kutkowski found only 11%, Talko Hrynewicz 15.5% of blonds amongst the Ukranian Jews. On the other hand, German ethnologists consider the existence of dark-haired Germans as established, with reservations, however, which would be anything but convincing to a sceptic. Houston Stewart Chamberlain describes as follows the colour of the hair of a black-haired Indo-Aryan: "But when this hair is seen lit up from the side, in the evening, for instance, with an electric light behind it, it is seen that the hairs are anything but black but have a ruddy tinge. You can imagine how

this confirms the hypothesis which I put forward in my *Foundations*, according to which the dark hair so frequently met with in the authentic German nobility has arisen from some sudden change or other and has nothing in common with the real black hair of other races. . . . I see now with my own eyes how a man's hair can be at one and the same time black and a ruddy brown." These remarks only show that imagination enables talented believers in the racial theory to cling to the beliefs which they desire to hold against all evidence and to see dark as fair and fair as dark. They recall the story told of Peter Altenberg, the only German Bohemian who, on looking at a Bologna Salami sausage, had a vision of Bologna and its Leaning Tower, and who exclaimed angrily, when reminded that the Leaning Tower was in Pisa: "I also see Pisa."

The thickness of hair may also be, though by no means certainly is, a racial characteristic: and it is equally uncertain whether it is variable or not. Scheffelt, a German ethnologist, found that among the lower classes of Thuringia, Saxony and Southern Germany, thick hair was more common, while thin hair predominated in the upper classes. German racial science concludes from this that thickness of hair is a racial characteristic, because the proportion of Nordics is greater in the upper classes and that of Orientals and East Baltics greater in the lower classes, whereas the facts may equally be due to differences in the mode of life and food of the various social classes.

Finally, the investigation of eye-colour gives the unexpected result that in the various countries of Europe 33% to 53% of the Ashkenazim Jews have light-coloured eyes. Amongst Galician Jews, according to Majer and Kopernicki, 12.5% have blue eyes, 17% grey eyes and 12% green eyes. According to Rutkowski, in Plonsk 23% have blue eyes, 9% grey eyes. Moreover, the results of ethnologists differ so greatly that amongst the Jews of Warsaw Czortkower counts 6% of Nordics, 21% of Mediterraneans and 20% of Armenoids, whereas Liepic only finds in the same group 2.35% of Nordics, 7% of Mediterraneans and 40% of Armenoids.

Racial study, in so far as it endeavours to distinguish between the varieties of the white race, offers few certain results up to the

present, especially as the existence of countless mixtures is no longer denied. That should not induce us, however, totally to reject the idea of race, as many of the opponents of German racial science would like to do. Races exist, that is obvious, and—if no attempt is made to transform a science still groping its way into a religion which is all the more fanatical for that very reason—it is possible by proceeding with caution to give the idea of race that real content which belongs to it despite all objections.

If one starts from the old division of mankind into white, black, yellow, red and brown races, one thing seems undeniable. A member of the black race and his descendants will stand out, no matter what they do and in spite of themselves, after generations amidst a white or yellow race; the same is true for a white amongst members of the yellow race, or a red amongst blacks. The colour of the skin seems to be the most characteristic and most invariable mark of race, although we have no exact knowledge of its cause or its purpose. But it is not only the colour of the skin: woolly and frizzy hair seems to be linked with blackness of skin, oblique eyes and the blue Mongolian mark with the yellow-skinned races. It is possible that other physical features characterise the races, and also moral and intellectual traits, such as the musicality of the Negroes, the thirst for intellectual progress of the whites, the indifference to death of the yellow race. In the present state of our knowledge we cannot define what race is, but we can discover what at least are its external marks: an individual and his descendants may be recognised as belonging to a race if, living in a foreign environment, their physical and intellectual distinctive features remain unchanged against their will through many generations, even if they participate in the culture of their environment, undergo the same education, speak the same language and belong to the same social class as those amongst whom they live.

Confusion arises as soon as we employ the same term "race" for the sub-races composing the great human races. Each of these principal races has a number of varieties. The white race consists of the Nordics, the Mediterraneans, the Eurasiatics, but these are differentiated much less by physical characteristics than the main races.

And it has not yet been formally established that characteristic features, such as the fair hair of the Nordics, the short stature of the Mediterraneans and the shape of the nose of the Armenoids, persist through the generations as do the characteristics of the chief races. This is all the more difficult to establish as only a small number of varieties of the white race are to be found in a pure state and because the large number of cross-breeds renders the discovery and the classification of the pure race almost impossible. Anyway, in the case of a Negro, a mulatto or even a quadroon, the physical type of the race is very obvious, whereas within the white race it is most difficult to classify individuals according to the different varieties to which they belong. It can only be done by most complicated methods, often open to grave suspicion, and rarely at first sight.

Secondary races are less easily distinguished from each other than the principal races. They seem to change and to adopt more easily the form of life of their environment, from which they can scarcely be distinguished. The differentiation is usually based less on physical than on psychological characteristics, which are reflected in facial expression and manner. An Italian belonging to the Mediterranean variety of the white race would scarcely differ from a dark-haired Dinaric, if it were not for the vivacity of his gestures and expression, primarily due to education, that is, to psychological influences. The brilliant and thoroughly sound basic idea of the German ethnologist, Clauss, is that physical and anatomical characteristics must be abandoned as distinguishing marks for the varieties of the white race. He has classified the secondary races into types, according to their mode of self-expression—the productive, dramatic, plodding and persevering, saviour and apocalyptic types. Now, it is true these types exist within the white race and it is even true that they often live together in closed communities and are thus differentiated in a striking manner from other human communities. But it is quite uncertain whether this is due to race, to environment or to the influence throughout the centuries of religious ideas and the education transmitted by them. It is, however, likely that psychological features, such as general style, facial expression and gestures, are conditioned much more by psychical than by physical

causes. I myself knew a little Italian who had grown up amongst German peasants and quickly developed into the silent type of what Clauss calls the productive man, whereas his brothers and sisters, educated in their own country, had all the vivacity of their Italian environment—the general style of the dramatic type according to Clauss.

When I was living in Vienna, a doctor showed me a little eight-year-old boy of pure Jewish ancestry who had been adopted, at the age of one, by an Aryan worker and brought up amongst her children. The most expert observer could not have distinguished him from the other children, either by his language, his gestures, or his expression. Perhaps from the physical point of view, by measuring the shape of his skull or the thickness of his hair, certain characteristics might have been found differentiating him from the others. But, and here Clauss is perfectly right, it is not the physical characteristics, at any rate in the first place, which have given rise to the idea of "races" within the white race. It is much more the psychological qualities of self-expression which may be influenced and modified by psychological environment.

It is only for secondary races, for varieties and not for main races, that the conceptions so often employed in political speeches and writings in Germany of "racial strength", "racial weakness" and "racial selection", have any sense at all. A race in the scientific sense of the word, a main race, can be neither strong nor weak. It exists or ceases to exist. Nor can it be bred, as the conditions of its origin are still completely obscure and because no new race has appeared within historical times. Further, it is not certain that humanity can be regarded as homogeneous from its origin. Serious scholars, like Melchers and Klaatsch, assume that the differentiation of white, yellow and black races goes back so far that their simian ancestors may not have been the same: according to them, there are unmistakably morphological and anatomical resemblances between the gorilla and the tall Negro, the chimpanzee and the dwarf Negro, the ourang-outang and the Indo-Caucasian, the gibbon and the Mongolian. This problem of races, the real problem, together with that of a single or multiple origin of humanity, has nothing what-

ever to do with modern political discussions on varieties—"secondary races", as German racial science also calls them—and hence with the Jewish problem. Here it is a question rather of the physical and intellectual value of varieties and of their greater or lesser degree of invariability, which undoubtedly depends on psychological or environmental influences and which, compared with that of the main races, is certainly extremely low.

One can therefore only speak of selection or assimilation of a race in connection with the varieties of a main race (assuming, therefore, that one applies the same term "race" to these varieties) and not with the main races themselves. Actually, in contrast to races in the strict sense, these "secondary races" may be definitely modified, physically and morally, in a shorter or a longer period. The more distinctive and apparently invariable a variety appears to be, the greater the temptation to speak of it as a race. It undoubtedly differs from a race by the fact that it is not invariable through many generations, but it has in common with a race the fact that its members and often their descendants differ from their environment through several generations, although from the standpoint of the nation they form part of it, sharing the same education, the same language, the same culture and the same civilisation. The more a race can transmit to its descendants for generations and despite its environment its specific qualities, the "stronger" the race is: the more it can be quickly assimilated by its surroundings the "weaker" it is.

Unquestionably the Jews do not constitute with reference to the white race, a race like the Negroes, Mongolians or Indians. They are but a variety within the white race and hence, like every variety, much more open to modification than a race, and, in many individual cases, scarcely to be distinguished from other varieties.

The mere fact that quite a large number of Jews, even of purely Jewish ancestry, cannot be recognised as such either by their physique, general manner or gestures, although their ancestors could, proves that here we are dealing with a variety and not a real race, as Negroes or Mongolians of pure descent always proclaim their race in a European environment. Again the regulation making

it necessary for Jews at certain times to wear a yellow patch on their clothes shows that one was afraid of not being able to distinguish them from the non-Jews. If their physical characteristics had been sufficient to differentiate them beyond doubt, no such distinctive sign would have been necessary.

The fact that in the book, written by the Chief Inspector of Schools, van Leers, *Jews Look at You*, the photographs of a number of undoubted non-Jews, such as Erzberger and Adenauer, could be published as typical Jews, proves that mistakes are possible which would be out of the question between members of the white, black or yellow races. The same is true of the mistakes made even by the experts. In the 36th edition, published in 1937, of the *Handbook on the Jewish Question*, by Fritsch, the author corrects statements made in former editions and announces that the authors, Rudolf von Gottschall and Christian Morgenstern, the famous conductors, Franz Schalk, Paul Gräner and Karl Much, the composer of "The Apostle" Wilhelm Kienzl and eight other artistes, one of whom was even "a War veteran and severely wounded", are neither Jews nor descendants of Jews. While this edition was in the press, a similar error was discovered and corrected on a special sheet with regard to the writers Norbert Jacques and Georg Kaiser. Nevertheless, the last-named had been chosen in the text as the representative type of Jewish spirit for having written "a brothel play". On page 378 of the 28th edition of the same handbook, the Irishman, George Bernard Shaw ("an insignificant writer of vaudeville; champion of anarchy both in his speeches and writings") and on page 387 the Englishman, John Galsworthy, are both described as Jews, and in the edition of 1934 Mark Twain is also assumed to be a Jew—which is simply not the case—"because of his typically Jewish style of writing". For the same reason Emil Zola, Gabriele D'Annunzio and Alexander Herzen are considered of Jewish stock. The greatest non-Jewish journalist in Austria, Ferdinand Kürnberger, and Joseph Kainz the actor, are classified as Jews—probably because they displayed talent in "Judaicised" professions. In the 1934 edition of Bartel's *History of Literature*, Franz Wedekind is described as a semi-Jew, "whose plays *Spring's Awakening* and *The Spirit of Earth* repre-

sent in a way the extreme of German decadence". A year later this same Nationalist scholar had to proclaim Wedekind's pure Aryan descent as a result of the action taken by his widow.

The contrary also happens. An outstanding Jew is taken for an Aryan—a mistake rendered difficult by the existence of dictionaries of Jewish patronyms. Thus, the Nationalist paper *Fridericus*, which specialises almost exclusively in the race question, contrasted the typically Jewish love of publicity of Count Arco, the Director of the German Radio-Telegraphic Company, with the typically German modesty of Baron von Lieben, the inventor of the radio valve. It turned out, however, that Baron Lieben was a pure Jew and that Count Arco was only a semi-Jew.

The important thing is not that these mistakes show negligence on the part of the authors, but that they are possible at all. The physical characteristics of the Chinese or the Negroes and the intellectual creations of these races run much less risk of being considered German or being attributed to the German spirit.

There is, however, one distinctive physical feature, the Jewish nose, which might justify the conclusion that the Jews are a genuine race and not a mere variety, produced in the main by a particular spiritual attitude. (According to the racial teaching of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, this physical peculiarity is a legacy of the Hittites, who however have since been recognised as Aryans. According to Passarge also, the Jewish nose, with a certain fullness of the mouth, is a Hamitic legacy and "the only feature by which the Jewish face can be distinguished in Europe", it being that of the natives of Southern Arabia and quite foreign to all European races.) But apart from the fact that a large proportion of Oriental Jews have not the typical Jewish nose and that, according to Lushan, the Jewish nose is a characteristic of the Armenoid or Oriental race—is it not striking how relatively rare this physical characteristic is among the Jews born in West and Central Europe? Even in van Leers's book, which so violently attacks the Jews, the photographs of the intellectual Jews, as for instance Rathenau, Jacob Wassermann, or Albert Einstein—under whose picture appears the words "Not yet hanged"—show that they have not the

Jewish nose. And the same is true of the pictures of Gustav Mahler, Liebermann or Paul Ehrlich. It might be worth investigating whether this characteristic is not produced by the fear characteristic of the ghetto, like the stoop and stunted growth. However that may be, Fishberg, after a careful examination of four thousand New York Jews found 60% Greek noses, 18% flat noses, 10% broad noses and only about 13% hooked noses. Passarge adds that only a fraction of the last-named noses could be considered as Jewish.

But if the Jews are not a race, they nevertheless constitute in a foreign white environment a variety which stands out morally and physically and whose peculiarities are based not so much on anatomical differences, in comparison with other varieties of the white race, as on the long persisting influence of certain ideas. In the majority of cases Jews do not stand out from their surroundings by the form of their skull or the colour of their hair, but above all by their gestures, facial expression and gait. All these, however, are the product of psychological forces and not of physical disposition. When a community has practised an isolated religion for two thousand years, and one whose precepts regulate life in its every detail, it is not astonishing that a considerable proportion of its descendants, even if this religion and its precepts have no longer any significance for them, are still noticeable after only a few generations by certain physical characteristics. Thus, for instance, Jewish observers derive the sing-song intonation of the Jews from the chanting of religious texts. The influence of a religion remains active in the mind and body long after its disappearance. Just as the rites of the vanished Germanic religions are preserved in the festivals of the solstice, and the primitive religion of Christian Negroes persists in their legends and customs, so also the spirit of the Jewish religion may still be recognised even amongst apostates by their attitude to life and their spiritual and physical manners. The Jewish writer, Karl Kraus, in his rigid morality and destructive criticism of his own Jewish community, even in his prophecies about the end of the world, resembled the Hebrew prophets who two thousand five hundred years before him strove with the same

passion and the same disregard for money and position to educate their contemporaries.

But whatever the cause of the distinctive peculiarities of the Jews, they undoubtedly exist. It is they which make the Jews appear within the white race as a variety more highly developed and more invariable than the others. The Jews, it is true, are far from preserving in each individual as clearly and for so long a time as Chinese or Negroes under the same conditions the distinctive peculiarities which make them distinguishable in a white environment. But they preserve them, nevertheless, throughout several generations even when they make considerable efforts to identify themselves with their surroundings. Frequently it is this passionate desire to adapt themselves at any cost which is a distinguishing feature. A Jewish noble or great merchant in Prussia is often more arrogant than a lieutenant of the Prussian Guards. In Vienna he is more Viennese than a real Austrian, in Hungary more chivalrous and more chauvinistic than a Magyar noble and in Switzerland more reserved than a German Swiss. In Poland I knew a lawyer whose Catholic piety—he always wore a cross under his tie—and lordly behaviour struck me even in that environment where both are common. It was their exaggeration which made me and everyone else realise that he was of Jewish origin and not a genuine Pole.

A well-defined variety has one feature in common with a genuine race; it reveals its peculiarities against the will of its representatives. It differs from it only through its greater variability and by the fact that a large number of individuals cannot be classified with any certainty.

German ethnologists by no means disregard the difference between a variety within the white race, such as the Jews, and a main race, like the Mongols, or at least they do not always do so. Günther, who incorrectly calls the Jews a nation—which they certainly are not, on account of the lack of all national factors amongst the Jews in Germany and elsewhere—first denies quite correctly their existence as a homogeneous race. Both the Sephardim, the Southern Jews and the Oriental Jews, the Aschkenazim, are composed in his view of a mixture of numerous races amongst whom the Oriental

race is dominant in the one case, and the Near-Eastern race in the other. Nevertheless, he concludes almost immediately afterwards that the Jews, as a result of their relative physical and moral invariability in the different countries, present such uniform characteristics "that they easily give the impression of a race", and he calls them "a secondary race", although he correctly maintains that a race is characterised by an invariability which is not to be found amongst the Jews. In this way all he does is to create a new term for the idea of variety in opposition to that of a race, the term variety not being popular enough to serve the educational aims which racial science is pursuing. This terminology, which applies the term "race" to a pronounced variety is so widely employed, despite its inexactitude, in German science and politics, that one simply could not hope to be understood if, in discussing the Jewish problem, one were to speak of antipathies or quarrels between varieties and of their relative powers of assimilation, instead of racial hatred, racial war and racial mixtures. That is why one is compelled to have recourse to this terminology and to employ, instead of the correct but rather clumsy expression "more or less constant variety", the term "race". It would otherwise be impossible to make use of such terms as "racial strength or racial weakness", absurd in themselves but consecrated by use, which taken in the sense of the strength or weakness of a variety would be most suitable for describing the difference between the Germans and the Jews.

As every human community which persists for any length of time produces physical effects—even though these be easily altered—every long-established national community, like the European nations, and every religious and cultural community, existing for thousands of years, like the Jewish, must develop distinctive physical as well as moral features, which are not based of course on invariable anatomical differences, as in the main races, but are rather physiognomical differences.

If these physiognomical traits, whether they be accounted for by heredity or education, appear in the descendants of the group through several generations in spite of changes of environment, the representatives of these varieties will stand out amidst foreign sur-

roundings by their peculiarities, although much less than the representatives of a truly different race would do. The more the distinctive peculiarities of a race tend to remain unchanged, the greater the "racial strength" it manifests. The more quickly they disappear, the "weaker" the community will be from the racial standpoint. If the term "race" be taken in the sense of "secondary race", one of the reasons for difference between Germans and Jews becomes obvious: the Germans are a great nation but a weak race; the Jews are a strong race but not a nation. That is why the former so ardently long to become a race and the latter desire equally passionately to become a nation.

In contrast to the Jews, amongst whom the influence of the earlier social and religious education is still to be observed in generations now completely withdrawn from it and who are therefore recognisable as a marked variety of the white race, the Germans are relatively a very weak variety, if they can be considered one at all. A German, transplanted to a foreign civilisation and sharing actively in the life of his new environment, can seldom be recognised as a German after twenty years, and in the opinion of many observers, to which I may add my own, can only be distinguished with difficulty from an Englishman, a Frenchman, an American, or a Spaniard. Certainly his offspring, even if of purely German parents, will almost always be completely assimilated by their environment. The United States provides the most striking example of the ability of the Germans to lose their distinctive character. Although, according to reliable statistics, the population consists of descendants of Germans and English in equal proportions (22% for each) German influence on the culture, the language, commercial habits and civilisation is weak and much less noticeable than that of the Irish immigrants (16%), or even of the Jewish immigrants with only 2½%. The same disappearance of German distinctive character in the single individual, generally during the first generation, is to be seen, however, in all other overseas countries, although during the nineteenth century emigration from Germany considerably exceeded at times that from neighbouring states. The noisy agitation of the Germans in South America cannot

conceal the fact that in comparison with the number and culture of other immigrants they are nowhere developing, but on the contrary are rapidly adapting themselves to the surrounding civilisation. It is only where organised masses, and not large numbers of isolated individuals emigrate, as in Milwaukee or in the linguistic islands of Hungary and Transylvania, that they tend to preserve their German character. As an individual the German adapts himself to a foreign environment more easily, perhaps, than the member of any other community in the world, even when he endeavours to preserve his distinctive national character, whereas the Jew as an individual always remains recognisable and distinctive even in his descendants, no matter how eager they are to be assimilated.

In the course of their history, the Germans have never been able to Germanise foreign nations except by force, though they have lost great parts of the nation through free decisions of the inhabitants. The Germanisation of the Slavs in East Prussia followed in the wake of a German invasion. On the other hand, the free separation of the Dutch from the German nation is unique in the history of modern times. At the same time as Provençal or the Falian language lost all political significance, a pure German-speaking branch in Holland detached itself voluntarily, without any political compulsion, from the German people. Similarly, in Switzerland to-day the German Front movement, artificially inflated but of no great depth, is much less important than the fact that the German Swiss now almost exclusively use their own dialect in everyday life and greatly prefer to use French in conversation rather than High German. Alsace-Lorraine was German for several centuries and French for less than two hundred years. Nevertheless it was found impossible, after having re-taken it in 1871, to incorporate it as old German territory into the body of the other states—for more than forty years it remained a province with a special government—whereas the French immediately after the World War recognised it as French like any other French Department and did not need to make any special laws for it.

The facility with which the Germans allow themselves to be assimilated and their inability to de-nationalise foreign communities

except by force is by no means any less valuable than the relative inability of the English or the Jews to allow themselves to be absorbed in a foreign community, an inability which it is customary nowadays to term "racial strength". For the greatness of the German nation depends actually on its racial weakness, namely on the extraordinary power—much greater than that of the French or the English—of absorbing foreign cultural elements and to assimilate them so completely that they become the magnificent and characteristic property of the nation. The literature of no country can boast as great an absorption of foreign poetry as the German literature can: Shakespeare became a German poet at a time when he was not particularly highly appreciated even in England. Modern German is due to Luther's translation of a Jewish book, the Bible. One of the greatest works of German poetry, Goethe's *Westöstlicher Divan*, blends for all eternity the Oriental spirit with German culture, and there are great German poets like Friedrich Rückert, whose importance consists in this ability to transform Persian, Indian and Arabic poetry into German poetry. In our own time no other nation of the world could adapt the sayings of Buddha and make them a living part of the spirit of the people in the way the German Neumann has done. Roman law would not be what it is to-day for all nations of the world, if the Germans had not appropriated it and, in virtue of their power of assimilation, had not made of it their national law and the juridical system of all Europe. Nothing can better characterise the intellectual confusion of the Third Reich than that the outstanding actions which best express the German spirit have been condemned as betrayals of the nation. What would German law be, even European law, if German scholars of genius had not given Roman law to the German people for its own greater good? A chaos of confused legal fragments and a source of permanent anarchy, as before that literally every village possessed its own institutions and its own laws. And if Charlemagne appears to the believer in the racial creed a traitor to the German cause because he imposed Christianity on the Saxons, the present guardians of German fame forget that the greatness of their nation throughout the Middle Ages and down to modern times is a product of the

passionate fervour with which the Germans absorbed Christianity, a fervour which brought them for many years first great political and then great spiritual power, and made the Emperors of Germany the true heirs of the Roman Caesars. Only a great nation (and a feeble racial variety) could make a foreign religion, law and art so completely its own, without being compelled by its own specific nature to reject what was foreign to it.

Strange fate of the Germans! As a nation, as a civilisation, they are amongst the richest in the world and, thanks to their invaluable power of assimilation, are destined to grow richer and richer, and yet they reject, in a strange limitation of their own powers, their best quality and desire to petrify into a pure race and shut themselves off from all influences in a self-imposed autarchy.

It was not always thus and above all amongst the Germans at present cited as shining examples of the German spirit. Alfred Rosenberg has drawn up a list of eight model Germans. Four of them, at least, abandoned themselves to foreign influences with special enthusiasm: Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, surrounded himself with Arabs and Jews and sought and found his true home in Sicily; Frederick II of Prussia, "The Unique", despised the German character and German art, took Voltaire for his literary model, habitually spoke and wrote French, and resorted to German only most unwillingly and with many mistakes, and did not think twice about allying himself with any foreign nation against the German Kaiser and the German Reich. Goethe was not only one of the great admirers of Shakespeare, but he translated Voltaire's *Mahomet*, was a great lover and adaptor of Oriental poetry, thought highly of Napoleon and was always extremely sceptical of the spirit of the German Wars of Liberation. Finally it has been shown that Meister Ekkehard, the most German of German thinkers, according to Rosenberg, was thoroughly familiar with the neo-Platonic philosophy summarised by the Jew Philo—which by no means diminishes but rather increases his importance—and strove to elaborate those ideas and to work them out to their logical conclusion. Another of Rosenberg's eight heroes, Widukind, fought, it is true against the supremacy of the Franks, though not for

national reasons, but after his final defeat worked so passionately for the Christianity so alien to his race that the Catholic Church gave him a place in the hierarchy of its saints, where he still is, and his descendants were famed for their fanaticism in the service of this religion. Formerly to accept foreign elements and to develop with the help of them was in the best German tradition—the tradition of a great nation but of an unstable variety. Nietzsche, regarded by a large section of German National-Socialists as a spiritual ancestor, was of the same opinion: “As a nation of the most incredible mixtures and amalgamations of races, perhaps with a predominance of the pre-Aryan element, as a middle people in every sense of the word, the Germans are more incomprehensible, more receptive, more contradictory, more unknown, more incalculable, more surprising and even more terrifying than other nations.”

It is true that for the moment the racial idea has such an exaggerated value in Germany that any doubt as to whether the Germans are or may become a race would already be considered as a hostile judgment. This is not the intention of the author and further would not correspond to the facts. To have “race” is more often a curse than a blessing, because the stability of the racial characteristics, and even the relative permanence of a well-defined variety, render more difficult adaptation to a world which is in constant evolution.

The present situation in India affords the most striking corroboration for the contention that striving for absolute pureness of blood even in a talented nation may result in complete impotence. There the prohibiting of the intermixture of castes—which from the beginning probably belonged to different varieties—must have led to the selection and to the preservation of more or less pure tribes. In India, the ideal officially pursued by German policy is actually realised and has been realised for countless centuries. Alfred Rosenberg said in this connection in his *Myth of the 20th century*: “Every European sees in Ancient India the Land of his dreams,” thus excluding from Europe the majority of Frenchmen and Englishmen, who detest the rigid caste spirit of the Indians. This

long effort to train warriors, priests, peasants and artisans as pure types, an attempt which is so much in harmony with modern German ideology, led to the utter impoverishment of India and to its permanent defencelessness against all foreign invaders, from the Persians and the Arabs down to the English. Further, it is by no means proven that purity of race, even of the Nordic race, develops the aptitude of leading other races and other nations. The Swedish nation, a Nordic variety infinitely more pure than the German or English variety, lost its political importance after a short period of glory, and the Norwegians, from the racial standpoint almost equally pure, never strove to dominate the world, or at least, if the Normans be considered as their ancestors, they abandoned that ambition long ago and did not even attempt to rule in America, which they nevertheless were the first to discover. Conversely, there were and are nations whose racial composition is so complex as to be impossible to ascertain, but whose national pride and ability to command other nations has nevertheless not been diminished. The Magyars, for instance, a people representing a mixture of Caucasians, Mongolians, Slavs and primitive natives of unknown origin, have beyond doubt their own distinctive character and are becoming more and more able to dominate and to de-nationalise other nations. In the same way, the Yankees, in whose country nations and human varieties of the most divergent types are blended, became in a relatively short time a specific human type which does not as a whole resemble, either physically or morally, any of the nations or varieties from which it is descended, but rather, at least in its externals, the Red Indians, with whom they are not united by blood. Yet in a very short time this American type has become the arbiter of the destiny of the world. And even if America to-day were to limit Slavonic immigration—less for racial reasons than because their low standard of life threatens to undercut too much the standard of the working class in the country—and were to oppose intermixture with Mongolian blood, the advantage of such measures would still be doubtful: whereas the United States, when nothing hindered racial intermixture, did actually have their periods of glory. The racial doctrine itself,

according to Günther, is "in the deplorable position of having to recognise that the great majority of Europeans are cross-breeds and mongrels". Nevertheless, these cross-breeds—degenerate cross-breeds like the French, according to the same authority—were able during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to claim first place in the civilisation, and at times in the political control, of the world.

If, therefore, the statement that the Germans are not a race—that is a marked racial variety—but a great nation, and the Jews the contrary, has nothing to do with any judgment on the relative value of Germans and Jews, it is nevertheless important for a comprehension of the German interest in the idea of race. For someone who has "race", such a condition is normal, it is neither pleasant nor unpleasant for him and he no more thinks of the advantages of it than of those of breathing. Only those in whom "race" is feeble, variable and subject to outside influences, long for greater invariability.

The marked varieties and strong races have no problem of blood and race. Either conscious of their strength they mix with other races or they refrain instinctively from doing so without the need of special prohibitive laws. The French, whose "racial spirit" and whose mode of life are extremely stable, always assimilate communities, even very different from their own, and impose on them the stamp of their culture, without being influenced by them to any appreciable extent. Not only the half-Jews, Anatole France and Bizet, but likewise the half-Negro, Dumas, are true representatives of the classical French mind and temperament. They were conquered by the French spirit and not it by them. The English on the other hand, without any legislation, make a very precise difference between the coloured races and the varieties of the white race. Everywhere in the East they avoid most strictly any contact with the former and ruthlessly exclude anyone who marries a Malay woman, a Polynesian or a Chinese. On the other hand, the marriage of an Englishman with a woman of one of the other white varieties is not exactly approved but has no adverse social consequences. In any case, both the English and French examples prove that laws and coercive measures have only a sense when there is a strong

natural tendency to perform the forbidden acts. To use the language of National-Socialism, they are only necessary if there is a marked tendency towards racial pollution or, to speak a more comprehensible language, if a large proportion of non-Jewish men are naturally inclined to love Jewish women and a large proportion of non-Jewish women to form attachments with Jewish men. For the greater the fanaticism with which such laws are enforced, the greater the natural tendency must be against which they are directed. If there were a natural sexual antipathy between Jewish men and German women or between German men and Jewish women, laws against their inter-marrying would be as unnecessary as laws against eating snakes or drinking sea-water.

The German courts of the Third Reich have unconsciously confirmed in a striking manner the view that the German man considers the Jewess, the German woman the Jew, as closely related. By decisions of the higher and highest courts marriages were dissolved on the grounds that all marriages between the higher Germanic race, represented by the husband unwilling to pay alimony, and the inferior race, represented by the Jewish wife, were incestuous and therefore completely null and void. Incest, however, at all times and in all languages, has never meant marriage between strangers but always marriage between two close relatives.

Psychologically, the lack of racial stability of the Germans is expressed not only in an exaggeration of the principle of race but even more in an unusual sensitivity to criticism of German character or of the heroes who are supposed to personify the German spirit. Only a community which is not sure of itself takes mockery with deadly seriousness, whereas a community sure of itself is amused at such mockery. If a German writer were to make fun of the character of the German people in the way the Irishman Shaw mocks at the English in many of his plays—in his comedy *Back to Methuselah* for instance, the heads of the British Government are Chinese and Negroes—not only would he not become celebrated but his life would be anything but safe. Actually Alfred Rosenberg in his *Myth of the 20th Century*, which is to be found in all libraries,

advances the "just demand": "Every German and every foreigner living in Germany who insults by word or deed the German people shall be punished according to the gravity of the case with imprisonment, penal servitude or death." A philosopher, the Jew Theodor Lessing, suffered the death penalty for attacking, not Field-Marshal Hindenburg, but the historical legend built up around him. (He compared the German national hero in one part of a long and friendly essay with a faithful St. Bernard watching over his people, that is to say with a dog: which was worthy of death.) Thomas Mann, one of the greatest authorities on Richard Wagner, to whom he devoted in his youth one of his best short stories, portrayed this national hero, in a very profound and intelligent study, not as the representative of all the Germanic virtues, but as a genius whose one-sidedness might have dangers for his people. Whereupon there were Germans, not only unknown writers but Germans with a name in art and science, including Hans Pfitzner, who paraded in the German manner their titles of Privy Councillor and Councillor, and demanded the expulsion of the critic from German civilisation. According to the draft of a new law published in all German newspapers, the disparagement of the racial idea is a punishable offence, like sacrilege in Catholic countries. Susceptibility to any insult to national honour is so great in Germany that a number of writers, including objective authors like the Viennese sociologist, Voegelin, account for the re-birth of anti-Semitism in Germany by a few phrases of the Jewish historian, Graetz, who described Heine and Borne as avenging angels sent to scourge Germany for its dissoluteness, and who in this way insulted Germany. Such a statement however, only proves the stupidity of the author and nothing else, for against this almost unique example of an insult to the German by a Jewish scholar there are without exaggeration thousands of contemptuous remarks by the Germans on the Jews, which however have not diminished the self-esteem of the latter or their extraordinary and often incomprehensible sympathy for the Germans.

A nation of low racial stability and with a consequent excessive desire for it, like the German nation, is always being offended by the

criticism of foreigners, even definitely inferior to them. A community of such a high degree of stability as the Jews is always ready to laugh at its own peculiarities because, as is natural, it sets no absolute value on the qualities it possesses. No community has produced so many jokes against itself which are effective just because of the combination of self-criticism, self-esteem and self-mockery. A friend once told me of a good remark made by a Jew about Jewish pride: "I am proud," he said, "to be a Jew; because if I were not proud of it I should be a Jew just the same." Apart from the fact that this remark condemns perfectly any exaggerated collective feeling, it also reveals its psychological origin. Only a community permeated with a sense of its inevitable stability could produce such a remark. It might be maintained, overstating a little, that the lack of stability in a variety produces racial pride whereas existing stability produces racial resignation. Unrealised wishes are coloured by pleasurable anticipation and hopeful enthusiasm for an unattainable future, realised wishes are not infrequently accompanied by a deep sense of disappointment.

Actually when an individual or a group are perpetually discontented—the same psychological law applies to the one as to the other—it is because they scarcely set any value on their real present state, and pay little attention to it, while longing with all their hearts for something which, once they had attained it, would satisfy them even less. An unhappy child ardently desires to grow up, underestimating the joys of childhood and overestimating the power and freedom of the adult, whereas for the weary adult childhood represents the magic land whose sorrows and trouble have long disappeared. Every human community places its paradise in a distant past which, when it existed, must doubtless have been even more miserable than the sad present. Every political party and every class which is not satisfied to the point of saturation believes in the eternal peace of a dream future until the moment when that future, having become the immediate reality, exceeds in horror all pasts. This dream of unhappy communities of being what they are not and of neglecting what they are is nowhere more apparent than amongst the Germans and the Jews, with reference to national

greatness for the former and to strength of race for the latter. The Germans, a great nation but a feeble race, desire nothing so much as to become a strong and pure race. To be merely a great nation does not satisfy them. The Jews, a much stronger racial variety, are anything but proud of it and desire to become a nation, which, should it be realised, would be of less value to the world than their present state.

The desire to become a race is so strong in the Germans that they do not even listen on this point to the counsels of racial science which otherwise play so large a part in the decisions of their rulers. It is in vain that Günther, the undisputed authority on this subject, expressly states that "the production of a German race is not a possibility of the future of Germany", the Nuremberg laws have decreed that only those of German blood can be German citizens. Contrary to the opinion of racial science itself, there will no longer be Aryan blood or Nordic blood in Germany but only German blood, specific to the German people and invariable in its characteristics. How this is to be determined still remains obscure. If the law were taken literally, it would mean the elimination from the German nation of three-quarters of the inhabitants east of the river Elbe, as all this region was Germanised very late by the knightly orders, and intermixture with the native Slavs was there the rule, in distinction to the Baltic provinces. Further, it would be necessary to expel the descendants of the Huguenots whose immigration during the eighteenth century polluted German blood. If these laws did not only exist on paper and were not interpreted in such a manner as to apply only to the Jews, the nation would be weakened in an incredible manner for the sake of a non-existent and illusory German race.

The Jews would suffer a similar weakening if, desiring to create a nation of their own, they were to leave the nations to which they belong and refuse to work within them as representatives of a variety with unusually clear-cut intellectual and moral characteristics. Zionism to-day, it should be noted, does not attract merely a section of the Jews themselves. It is even more attractive to their enemies, so that every anti-Semitic book sees in it the sole hope of salvation

for the Jewish community. Seeing that humanity is not very prone to do good to its enemies, this is enough to make an unbiassed observer rather sceptical. Actually in spite of all the sacrifices made for it, Zionism still takes the form more of wishful dreams and emotions than of action. Of course, the efforts and the success of the 3% of Jews who are at present active in Palestine cannot be questioned. But as against these 3% there are another 97%, a part of whom are willing in theory to leave the nations to which they belong, but not in practice. Suppose the Jews really decided—which would be regrettable even from the point of view of the nations which have accepted them—voluntarily to give up the positions they occupy there, even if only as poor relations, to abandon their professions of lawyer, of doctor, of professor, to resign from their State posts, to withdraw from journalism and literature, in America as well as in Europe, in a word to leave the positions which they undoubtedly hold and which in spite of their present defeats still exist for them, they would certainly have realised their desire to be a nation, but at the same time lost their importance as an influential racial variety. The world would be the richer for a nation of 15,000,000 inhabitants, but to speak with Bernard Shaw, it would have become infinitely more boring. If the Zionists of Europe and the U.S.A. believe it possible—as would appear to be the case—to belong to a Jewish nation, while leaving at the same time the majority of their nationals in other countries, where they would continue to occupy positions which otherwise would go to the subjects of those nations, they remind one of the Jewish joke about the car-washer who declared that, if he were Rothschild, he would be even richer than Rothschild: “for,” said he, “first I should have Rothschild’s fortune and then by continuing to wash carriages I should have my wages in addition.” Again, a Jewish proverb says: “It is impossible to dance at two weddings at the same time.”

Actually Palestine is not the mother-country but only the rightful sanctuary of the Jews. Not only could the country, even with ~~the~~ most intense colonisation, receive no more than a quarter of the Jews at most, but at present only a section of the Jews, despite the difficulty of their position, desire it as a home. Only a fraction

of the well-to-do and intellectual German Jews who left Germany and could freely choose their new home, emigrated to Palestine, whereas the rest remained true to the old destiny of the Jewish variety to build up their difficult and blessed, their fruitful and fearsome, their despised, envied and ever-dangerous life elsewhere and to devote themselves to foreign nations.

The relative strength of Jewish "racial spirit" and the relative weakness of that of the Germans explains the peculiar phenomenon of the struggle against the Jewish spirit. The Germans are extremely easy to influence and, lacking psychological means of defending themselves on account of their peculiar character, do so by means of force. If the Aryans or the Nordics at present governing Germany were really spiritual conquerors and the creators of civilisation as they maintain, they would have no need of book-burning or of censorship or of excluding certain books from their libraries and making others compulsory there, because if there is only one race of rulers with creative genius it can only be the others who must fear its influence. Racial literature makes a hero of the Aryan or the Nordic, subject to neither physical nor moral influences, who according to Clauss "strikes down the dove like a hawk", but in practice the Third Reich most anxiously protects him against the ideas of other communities and their moral and intellectual influence as if he were an infant and not a Viking.

It ought to be quite natural for a nation of rulers to take foreign intellectual property wherever they find it, even by pillage, and having transformed it, to make it their own, as Shakespeare, Boccaccio and all great geniuses have done without a second thought at all times. But to fear Jewish professors, French books, Negro music or whole-tone adventurers, because the spirit of the hawk might be permeated by the feelings of the dove proves that in Germany the roles are actually reversed. It is not the Jews who fear the dominating spirit and racial strength of the Germans, ~~but~~ the Germans who fear the racial strength of the Jews. The spiritual isolation of the Germans in Europe, their rejection of everything alien, especially Jewish, spring from the desire to dream in a self-imposed solitude of a spiritual dictatorship over the world

without being disturbed by the latter—a dream which, like so many other consoling dreams, accomplishes in imagination the desires that the dreamer could not possibly satisfy in the world of hard reality. Neither the English nor the French need to shut themselves off from the Jewish spirit because after learning to know the products of the race, it either accepts and nationalises them or simply rejects them instinctively. For an easily-influenced community it is the blind fear of letting themselves be further influenced—and the fact that its mental state after an heroic but unsuccessful and futile war has infinitely strengthened its longing to be a nation of hard and invincible rulers—which explains this fear. Otherwise it would be incomprehensible, seeing that the other community is a hundred times smaller, knows nothing of its fears and desires and is thus particularly suitable for being utilised as its antithesis.

Actually the Jews, and above all the German Jews of the nineteenth century, had only one desire, namely to lose as quickly as possible their specific character, so profoundly rooted as to seem unalterable. Not Zionism but the desire to be assimilated is characteristic for the Jews of Central Europe. Whereas 20,000 Jews emigrated from Central Europe to Palestine during the forty years preceding the National-Socialist Revolution—the greater part of the 180,000 immigrants of this period came from Poland and Russia—in Protestant Germany alone in the nineteenth century, according to the investigations of de la Roi, three times that number voluntarily left the Jewish community to be baptised and a much larger number still, who for psychological reasons refused to be baptised, gave up all connection with Jewish tradition, education and mentality in order to become spiritually Germans. The psychological situation of the Jews is the direct contrary of that of the Germans: amongst the latter the dream of a racially weak, easily influenced nation to become as quickly as possible an invariable race, in the former the burning desire to lose their racially strong peculiarities at the price of disappearing completely. When Clauss maintains that ~~the~~ supreme moment in the life of a Nordic is the “marriage feast with death” little support can be found for it amongst the strongly Nordic races such as the unarmed Danes, the pacifist Norwegians

and the socialist Swedes. On the other hand, the German Jews have actually experienced death in marriage. For every marriage of a Jew with a German, every mixed marriage, involved inevitably the expulsion of the Jewish partner from the Jewish community, so that the children of such marriages had no longer any connection with Judaism, either through education or tradition, religion or morality. I myself have known a case in which a sub-leader of the Silesian organisation of 1919, of the third generation of baptised Jews and unrecognisable as a Jew either anatomically or physiognomically, had suddenly in 1933 to cease being a German and suffered a complete nervous break-down in consequence. It is also well-known that one of the leaders and organisers of the Steel Helmets after the War was of Jewish origin. If the assimilation of the German Jews be considered for once from the Jewish standpoint, it is clear that whereas for the Germans it represents the "pollution" of a very small percentage of Germans by Jewish blood, for the Jews it literally means extinction, namely the permanent loss of half the community and actually of the more highly-developed half.

According to official statistics, there were between 1900 and 1927, 33,800 mixed marriages out of 103,000 Jewish marriages, that is to say, one third, and only 20% of the children of these marriages remained within the Jewish community. Whereas in Prussia in 1876 only 4½% of the Jews contracted mixed marriages, in 1927, 21½% did so, so that including the Jews converted and baptised within the last thirty years in Germany, nearly 100,000 Jews (only 1½% per thousand of the German population but 20% of the Jewish) were lost to Judaism. The distinctive characteristics of the Jews have been preserved not by Zionism and its leaders, not by Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau, but by Adolf Hitler. It is only by force and not of their own free will that this "racially strong" but equally "racially weary" variety could be compelled to maintain their "invariability". And even now—according to a Berlin joke of ~~these~~ truth the foreigner can easily convince himself—the greatest sorrow of the majority of German Jews is that, because of the anti-Semitic article of the National-Socialist party programme, they cannot become Hitlerites.

This is the strange but real antithesis! A receptive and easily-influenced community like the German nation wishes to be morally and intellectually independent, whereas a strong variety like the Jews wishes to lose its distinctive features and to be absorbed. He who lacks spiritual independence and self-sufficiency desires it, whereas he who enjoys it, imprisoned within the limits of his character, wishes to lose those distinctive features which seem to him a misfortune.

This desire amongst Jewish intellectuals to lose their rigid specific character and to be dissolved in a foreign community with a future is not new in the history of Judaism. The Jews have never tried to transmit to other nations their culture, education or religion. On the contrary, what is typical of them is that their best qualities are only released by the wish to be absorbed in an alien community and to serve its development. If they were spiritually isolated at any time, whether voluntarily or by compulsion, and consequently forced to preserve their racial invariability, their qualities—with the exception of religion—invariably declined, as probably happens frequently in autarchic communities, even when economic conditions are favourable. How many remarkable talents appeared amongst the German Jews when they had the opportunity of contributing to the culture of the people who had received them! Since the emancipation, since Moses Mendelssohn in Germany and Josef Sonnenfels in Austria, the Jewish variety of the German nation has been made extraordinarily fertile by Germany and repaid it by devoting all its energy to the nation which it recognised as its own. The Jews have never influenced German culture by imposing on it Jewish ideas, but they owe their own development and productivity to German education and the ideas of West-European civilisation.

This is not an isolated case in Jewish history. As soon as the Jewish elements abandoned their antagonism to the Greco-Roman culture of the Empire, writers appear of the standing of a Flavius Josephus and philosophers as important as Philo. There were no Jewish troubadours as long as Jewish culture remained autarchic, but a large number of them after the Jews began to participate in the

Arabic culture, and their best poets, Jehuda ben Halevy, Solomon ben Gabriol and, amongst philosophers, the undying figure of Maimonides, are unthinkable apart from Arabic civilisation.

It is, however, not only the cultural qualities but also those considered pernicious which develop in a foreign environment. As long as they lived as a separate variety in a state of economic and moral autarchy, no particular commercial aptitude was revealed by the Jews. Jewish usury, like the capitalism arising from money lent at interest which Sombart in particular considers a Jewish invention, does not exist among the Jews as long as they remain amongst themselves. Only the economy of the nation amongst whom they live also develops their faculties in this direction. They did not invent capitalism as Sombart believes, but, according to Brentano, developed and furthered it in those nations in which it existed in an embryonic state, just as they did the spiritual culture of such nations. If capitalism be considered a work of the devil, as it is by official National-Socialism—although till now no economic system has been known to history which was able like capitalism to double the population of the European continent within a century and at the same time to improve the conditions of life—then the Jews are the collaborators of the devil, but not the Prince of Darkness himself nor even his chief lieutenants. The restlessness of the Western people which drove them to conquer time and space and continually to increase production, combined with the spirit of Protestant individualism, created the foundations of the capitalistic system. The Jews only erected certain pillars of the structure already provided for in the plan.

Only within a foreign culture and economy did the Jewish genius and Jewish business sharks appear. That does not mean, as some have thought, that here we were dealing with imitations and not genuine phenomena. They were real geniuses and real criminals about whom nothing would have been heard if they had not had a chance of developing within and for the sake of a foreign culture and economy.

Hitler and others before and after him have noted the fact of Jewish adaptability to a foreign community and have consequently

termed them a parasitical race. Nothing is further from the truth. The parasite lives for itself alone. It is indifferent to the fate of the host on which it lives and which it uses for its own ends. The Jews might have been called parasites if they had made use of the products of German, English and French culture and economy to create an autonomous and independent Jewish culture in the midst of the nations which had given them a home, and if they had contributed to the culture of these nations no more than mistletoe does to the foliage of the oak. Actually the contrary is the case. The Jewish intellectuals of Central Europe work not only through the culture of the nations which received them but also for that culture. In one of his most beautiful poems Heine does not boast—as a parasite would do—of being a Jewish poet famous abroad, but of being a German poet known in German lands. To make German culture their own, not in order to create a Jewish culture but for the purpose of living and dying for German culture—just as the aim of Disraeli was the greatness of England and not of Judah—was the aim and longing of all the great Jewish minds in Germany since the end of the eighteenth century.

That is precisely the great difference between the receptivity of the Germans for foreign culture and the Jewish love of German culture. The Germans adopted Roman law, Christianity and foreign literatures to incorporate them into their own culture. The Jews, on the other hand, impregnated themselves with German culture in order to develop it and not to further Jewish culture. The aim of the former was the enrichment of their own mentality by the absorption of foreign intellectual products, the aim of the latter, the eradication of their own distinctive features for the benefit of a race which they loved. To-day, therefore, in their misfortunes, the Germans racially feeble and receptive, see their salvation in the contrary idea, in autarchy. The Jews of Central Europe, equally unhappy on account of their racial stability, wished to lose it and be absorbed into their environment in order that old Ahasverus should at last find the peace which once again seems to have been refused him.

These two opposed tendencies, on the one hand the desire for intellectual autarchy, on the other the longing for self-abandonment

out of love of the foreigner, define the modern attitude of the Germans and the Jews to the idea of race. The Germans, obliged by their historic destiny not to recognise their most precious talent, which they consider a weakness, see their only salvation in abandoning their receptivity and racial weakness—which in reality constitutes the strength of their nation—and react violently against foreign influences, to their own detriment. The German-Jewish fragment of a racial variety on the other hand, trying for decades to give up its own character, unwillingly remembers—a disdained lover—its racial strength, and, abandoning its dream of being absorbed into the German community, clutches at the plank of Zionism.

But however clearly the character and the fate of both parties is reflected in their relation to the idea of race, the psychological elements have not yet been described which have led to the spiritual and political war now being waged by the two communities. It must be established that there is no question here either for the Germans or for the German Jews, of eternal and unalterable characteristics which have given rise to the present situation, but of an historical evolution which the spectator, according to his conception of history, will consider as a divinely-ordained necessity or as a unique accident.

The author will therefore attempt in the following chapter to show, first, that the dogma of the invariability of moral characteristics in a human community is a mistake which tends to prevent the growth of all historical knowledge, in order to explain afterwards the psychological evolution of the Germans and the German Jews since the end of the eighteenth century, which is the principal cause of their antagonism to-day.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Psychological Development of Human Communities

Menghin, an Austrian scholar, points out that differences in national character undoubtedly exist but also that so far our definitions of the moral and intellectual qualities of a race have been highly coloured by feeling and hence liable to many errors. An illustration of this is the opposition between the intellectual and political attitude of contemporary Germany and that of the German-Jewish racial variety, which has existed roughly since Bismarck's victory and still exists, and for which, nevertheless, despite the many controversial works on the subject, all highly subjective in tone, no explanation has been given.

Two axioms frequently used by the German science of the racial soul are obstacles to an objective judgment on this subject: the first attributes certain universally human characteristics to particular races, and the second maintains the invariability of the psychological structure of human communities.

The belief according to which certain human qualities such as loyalty, bravery and contempt of money characterise certain races or certain nations and are unknown to others is particularly sharply defined in German racial science and in German politics. Beginning with H. St. Chamberlain and down to the political catechism, published officially by the Party in thousands of copies in August 1934 as *Principles of Political and Philosophical Education*, the German community of the Aryan and Nordic race appears as the paragon of all life-giving virtues while the Jewish race on the other hand is its antithesis, the "anti-race" as it is often called.

Thus Hitler in *Mein Kampf* first draws a picture of the Aryan, the essence of whose nature is his productive activity, his sense of duty,

his idealism, his subordination of the life and interests of the individual to the welfare of the community, and contrasts with it the portrait of the Jew who is "egoism personified" and to whom the spirit of sacrifice is utterly unknown, so that "if the Jews were alone in the world they would be smothered in dirt and filth". The Jews "are devoid of collective spirit" and "like a pack of wolves, unite only to attack their prey, but once their hunger is satisfied go each their own way". That is why "they lack all true culture, creative power and idealism", and in contrast to the powerful Aryan hero are typical parasites and spongers.

Similarly Alfred Rosenberg thinks that in the Nordic lying is an exceptional and pathological symptom. It reflects however the real character of the Jew: "He who abandons himself to lying is spiritually lost and is bound to leave the Germanic environment. He will be obliged to mix with nondescript mongrels and Jews. . . . If deliberate and organised lying means death for the Nordic it is the vital element for the Jew." Hence the liking of Jews for democracy—which is most highly developed, it is true, in Teutonic England—for this system is based on the deception of the masses and large-scale exploitation. Honour, law, power and freewill belong only to the Nordic. They were absent in the Roman-Syrian hybrids and in the Jewish nation.

This method which consists in attributing all virtues to one's own community and all the vices to the foreign community finds its most exaggerated expression in the propaganda literature according to which the future lieutenants and soldiers of National-Socialism are to be educated. In the political catechism written for this purpose by Hans Jörg Männel, the Principal of the Second School of Provincial Leaders in Saxony and advisor on political education to the military staff of the Saxon Group, and in a number of other works of the same type distributed by order of the Party, the entire spiritual and political history of the world consists of this struggle between the German and the Jewish soul: "It is a gigantic struggle of blood against money, of personality against the masses, of honour against infamy, of the spirit of sacrifice against personal interest, of discipline against selfishness. Ultimately it is a world struggle between

the rapacious Jews and the productive Germans." All political, economic and philosophical doctrines lead therefore finally and always to this fact that the Jewish mentality and the German mentality are the two opposite poles in history, as is shown by the following table ("Write on the blackboard" says the official author).

*Liberal and Marxists Philosophy
of the Nineteenth Century*

Democracy
Liberalism
Internationalism
Pacifism
Class War
Capitalism
Marxism
Materialism
Judaism

*National-Socialist Philosophy
of the Twentieth Century*

Dictatorship
Socialism
Nationalism
Fighting Power
Community of the Nation
Labour
Nationalism
Idealism
Germanism

Many other National-Socialist works describe the German nation as the model of an heroic community which is loyal and courageous, contemptuous of money, kind, chaste, productive and prizing honour above all things and oppose to it the Jewish "anti-race" as treacherous, cowardly, avaricious, cruel, lascivious, spiritually impotent, arrogant and destitute of all sense of honour.

This simple and therefore extremely suggestive presentation, which recurs in hundreds of German newspaper articles as well as in the writings of the pundits of racial science, gives a schematic picture of reality at the expense of truth. It is in the first place most improbable that moral qualities, whether they be virtues or vices or even philosophies, which occur amongst all nations and races and are therefore common to humanity, could be a permanent characteristic of one particular nation. Actually virtues and vices seem to appear in each nation in different degrees according to the period. Thus many Germans can actually be taken as models of

loyalty, and throughout whole periods of German history, that of chivalry, for instance, loyalty was actually the focal centre of life. Similarly in our own time Otto von Bismarck—a rare case for a genius—was a model of loyalty to his by no means outstanding sovereign. But with the same right with which one can proclaim loyalty as a German national quality on the basis of these examples one can also show that treachery is a German vice. Since the dynasty of Merovingians in which relations fought cruelly and ferociously against each other, brother against brother, husband against wife, breaking faith without the slightest scruple, and which was dethroned by the Carolingians as treacherously as it had ruled, Germanic and German history is full of the struggles of forsworn princes against the Emperor; of forsworn vassals against their liege lords; of betrayals of the nation by alliance with foreign nations, with the French and the Swedes during the Thirty Years War, and again with the French during the period of the Rhineland Federation; of breaches of solemnly concluded agreements, as in the war of Frederick the Great against Maria Theresa, down to the tearing up of the "Scrap of Paper" which was the treaty guaranteeing Belgium neutrality. The first German word recorded by history is, according to a German historian whose work appeared in 1934, *Heerisliz*—that is, desertion, and is used in connection with the broken oath of the Duke of Bavaria to the King of the Franks. Even in literature where, it is true, German loyalty is often praised—which may be, as in the case of every work of art, the fulfilment in imagination of a wish-dream which cannot be realised in reality—its opposite equally provides many a theme. "When loyalty was born," says a German folk-song, "it flew into a hunter's horn; hunter blew it in the wind, so one never it can find."

Just as little therefore as the Germans can be considered more loyal or more treacherous than other nations, both qualities being found in different periods of their history and in different political and psychological situations, just as little is treachery characteristic of the Jews. Admittedly there is a large number of perfidious Jews, as is shown at the present time by the many baptisms which take place for purely material considerations, or by the example of

the German-Jewish poet who, in order to be able to remain a National-Socialist official, accused his own mother of having conceived him in adultery. But at the same time this same community has held fast with exemplary loyalty to their religion, and the German-Jewish community which emigrated to Poland has remained faithful to the German language in spite of all persecutions. Even the Central European Stock Exchanges, dominated for the most part by Jews, which seem to an outsider sinks of iniquity, may be cited as an example: whoever on the Stock Exchange raised his finger even by mistake, so that his agreement with the gesture of another could be concluded from it, had to fulfil his contract, and breach of contract was punished by exclusion from the Exchange for a long time and the publication of the offender's name on the notice board. Loyalty is so typical of the relations between members of the Stock Exchange amongst themselves—not always towards their customers—that according to a humorous remark of a German lawyer loyalty was invented on the Stock Exchange and not at the knightly tournaments of the Germans.

The same is true of other traits of character. No one will deny that Germany is one of the bravest nations in the world. It has given proof of this in innumerable battles throughout its history and during the last war. But this bravery was not displayed at all times and towards everyone. Some hundreds of insignificant princes ruled Germany during the eighteenth century, sold their subjects to foreign countries, oppressed their people in the most infamous manner (more ruthlessly even than Louis XIV), maintained serfdom, the *corvée*, even the *jus primae noctis*, and yet there was no display of courage against these little tyrants on the part of the great masses of the population. Conversely the Jews, whose lack of physical courage is frequently mocked at to-day, have known periods in their history when, as far as bravery is concerned, they could have been compared with any German of olden times. In the Jewish War they withstood for three whole years the might of the Roman Empire, and during the siege of Jerusalem showed a contempt of death which has certainly been equalled but never surpassed by other nations. And whatever one may think about the role of the

Jewish revolutionists in Russia from 1905 to 1918, their heroic fanaticism cannot be denied.

The opposition between blood and gold—blood as the eternal natural symbol being the inspiration of the German nation; gold, the hard symbol of power, attracting the Jewish community—which recurs continually in the works of National-Socialist writers and is the title of a work by one of its literary leaders, Otto Bangert, is anything but appropriate to characterise the spiritual difference between Germans and Jews. Even the ancient Teutons displayed such a craving for gold that, according to the testimony of the German Dopsch, the greatest authority on old Germanic economic history, the Roman Empire became poor in gold because the Germans demanded such enormous quantities of it and carried it away with them. According to Soetbeers, citing Herodianus, "The Germans were particularly greedy for gold and never concluded peace with the Romans without receiving payments in gold." The Visigoth Alaric raised the siege of Rome in 408 against a payment of 5,000 lbs. of gold and 30,000 lbs. of silver. Montelius, confirmed by Dopsch, says of the abundance of gold in Sweden in the fifth century A.D.: "The wealth of gold in Sweden in the fifth century corresponds to the gold sent by the Roman Empire to the Barbarians at the end of the fourth century." The treasures of the Avars were the cause of two of the campaigns of Charlemagne, the wealth of the Near East one of the chief motives of the Crusades. The German Fuggers and the Hansa towns placed as high a value on the goods of this world as the Rothschilds, and Germans like Stinnes and Lahusen had nothing to learn from the Jewish multi-millionaires of the inflation. The latter indeed were far surpassed by the Prussian Junkers who, to retain their property, were able by most questionable methods to squeeze 200,000,000 marks out of the exhausted State, and then succeeded in suppressing the scandal which threatened over this subsidy to the Eastern Provinces, involving a sum three times as great as that of the Stavisky affair which in democratic France led to street fights and almost a civil war.

The gentle kindness typical of the German is considered another trait which makes him the antithesis of the Oriental in whom,

according to the racial authority, Clauss, cruelty is the outstanding feature. For this reason Arthur Dinter, one of the leading writers of the new Germany, classifies Jesus without further investigation as an Aryan because he taught the love of one's neighbour, a doctrine peculiar to Aryans. But though it is true that the religious cult of Semitic Carthage stood out on account of its cruelty and that many incidents in the Old Testament—such as the destruction of a whole town on account of the "race pollution" suffered by Dinah the daughter of Jacob—proves the existence of cruelty as a trait in the Jewish character at certain periods, the tortures in common use at the time of the witch trials amongst the Nordic, Dinaric, Alpine and Mediterranean races surpassed in the horror of their duration and severity every similar practice amongst the Orientals. Scherr, one of the great admirers of the German nation, reports that the torture applied by Germans to Germans began with this official formula: "Your body shall be made so thin by torture that the sun will shine through it," and he continues "that was no empty threat. The pen refuses to describe the horrors committed by means of burning alcohol and sulphur, by thumb-screws, Spanish boots, the ladder, the spiked hare and other instruments of torture on countless people accused of sorcery, including even pregnant women." The most horrifying book in the world, *The Hammer of the Sorcerer*, is the work of two Germans, Jacob Sprenger and Heinrich Institoris. For those who might be tempted to see in these phenomena only one of the effects of the Oriental mind acting, as Rosenberg maintains, through Catholicism on the kindness of the German mentality, it should be sufficient to recall the horrors of the Merovingian epoch or of the Carolingian, Louis the Pious, who, when his nephew Bernhard claimed his unquestioned rights had "his eyes torn out with such cruelty that he died a few days later". Undoubtedly there were true Germans living at the same time, especially in the monasteries, who were as innocent of all cruelty as the Arabic poets and scholars of the same period. A prominent German ethnologist, Rudolf Steinmetz, admiring the German kindness is, however, convinced of the cruelty of a people with a large proportion of Nordic blood, namely, the Anglo-Saxon nation.

"Undoubtedly there exists in every nation temperaments capable of brutal cruelty," says he, "but thinking of the fate of the Irish, the Redskins, the Maoris, the Australians and the Boers, we have the impression that this type is particularly strongly represented in the Anglo-Saxon race."

Frequently a connection is established between the cruelty of the Oriental race and its sensuality, with which the chastity of the Nordic race or of the German nation is contrasted. "Nordic love," says Clauss, "has always an element of inner remoteness; even when it ends in desire it always begins with longing," and we find similar phrases on the chastity of German love in the writings of a large number of national authors. But if Novalis, who actually did spend his life in chaste regrets for his dead love, was a German, Harmann the homosexual murderer was also a German and his numerous victims had not much opportunity of admiring the chastity of his nature. The same applies to the German mercenaries. At certain times they were the embodiment of the German spirit and German power in Europe and satisfied their chaste longings by raping countless women during the dreadful sack of Rome in 1527. That does not prevent Adolf Hitler from describing the sexual lust of the Jews very vividly: "This poisoning of our blood, to which thousands of our own people seem to be blind, is practised systematically by the Jews. Systematically these black parasites rape our fair young girls and thus destroy something which can never be replaced in this world." Nevertheless the Old Testament, almost National-Socialist in this connection, strictly forbids intermixture with foreign races, and adultery, even with foreign women, is so unknown amongst Polish Jews that they seem first to have learned sexual freedom in Germany under German influence.

Sombart, a German witness, reproaches the Jews, on the other hand, with their chastity. According to him it is the same spirit which has prevailed since Moses, first in the Bible, then in the Talmud and in Rabbinical literature: "One might almost say, fear of woman. . . . Lust, murder and idolatry are the three deadly sins which cannot even be expiated by death." But to speak of chastity as a Jewish ideal is undoubtedly to depart as much from the truth

as Hitler does when he accuses the Jews of sadism. Gleaning examples throughout the centuries Hitler does not see that many Aryan women prefer Jewish husbands because of their traditional fidelity, whereas Sombart forgets the *Song of Songs*, that eternal hymn to carnal love. The fundamental error of this method is always the same. From isolated events or from the character of a few members of the beloved or hated community—from events and characters frequently separated by centuries—general conclusions are drawn, as if the fact that, according to Scherr, in 1484, the nuns in many convents “were in an interesting condition” would prove the looseness of all German nuns, or the Merovingian murderess and royal prostitute, Fredegundis, would personify for ever the German type of womanhood.

Even the statistical method, though less naïve than this subjective and intuitive one, gives doubtful results for moral qualities. Thus according to the Italian statistician, Augusto Bosco, between 1896 and 1899, there were 9.4 sexual crimes for every 100,000 inhabitants in Germany, in England, on the other hand, only one-sixth of that number (1.5), in France only one-ninth (1.1). This result would seem to disprove categorically the supposed immorality of the French and the vaunted virtue of the Germans. But from these figures might it not be concluded with equal justice that actually the number of sexual crimes in Germany was not greater than elsewhere but that more were reported and that the German judges, representing a more austere nation, condemn as crimes what French judges dismiss as trifles of no importance?

If these figures, despite their apparent precision, prove nothing even for elementary psychological traits, the results of a schematic description of the national character will be particularly grotesque when more complex spiritual phenomena, such as the difference between philosophical or religious ideologies, are deducted from a comparison of national characteristics. “Materialism,” explains the political catechism which inculcates to the German masses the truths established by National-Socialist philosophy, “is typically Jewish, idealism, typically German.”

With the exception of Karl Marx, however, the majority of

Jewish philosophers in the nineteenth century were representatives of the idealist movement and hostile to materialism. Hermann Cohen, the Marburg philosopher, founded Neo-Kantism. Frauenstädt untiringly preached the philosophy of Schopenhauer. Brandes was lecturing on Nietzsche at a time when all German Universities still neglected him completely. Otto Weininger lived his idealistic doctrine with such intensity that, seeing the impossibility of realising it, he committed suicide. Stahl, indifferent to material goods, based his system exclusively on eternal values. Adolf Lasson gave new life to Hegelianism which had been thought dead. Simmel attempted the only psychology of money which accounts for the value placed on it in terms of spiritual elements. Carl Joel was one of the first to oppose the mechanistic philosophy of his time. Scheler was the founder of a theory of ethical values. Edmond Husserl, the founder of German phenomenology, provided against his will the philosophical foundation of the racial doctrine. Bergson teaches an anti-materialistic voluntarism. Freud, the great visionary, showed how ideas and experiences could influence and modify the body. The fact that of all these Jews Karl Marx alone seems to have had any decisive influence on the Germans is something which does not so much explain the materialist tendency of the Jews as that of the Germans during this period. For Moleschott, who believed that thought was a secretion of the brain, and Haeckel and Bölsche who, like the majority of scientists of the middle of last century, hoped to solve all the problems of the universe by the investigation of matter, were Germans and not Jews.

If, however, idealism and materialism be not regarded as philosophical doctrines but as moral conceptions, the first of which involves the supremacy of spiritual, the latter of material values, both can be found at different times or even at the same time in the German as well as in the Jewish community. The German professor who, busy with intellectual problems, forgets wife, children, food and umbrella, must not make us forget the feasts of the German bourgeoisie in the Middle Ages or the peasant marriages in many districts to-day where at one marriage feast ten oxen, one hundred geese, five pigs and fifteen pails of wine were served. Similarly the

ostentation of Wilhelm II, who has found a worthy successor in Goering, is not exactly an example of contempt for the splendours of this world.

As for the exaggerated importance which Polish Jews attached to money and which earned for them such a bad reputation, it is balanced in this community by such a high esteem of spiritual goods, that in Galicia to-day just as thirty years ago the richest man of the village is proud to give his daughter to the poorest but to the ablest scholar of the Talmud. In the marriage contract he agrees to keep his son-in-law for seven years in order to enable the latter to pursue his studies. It is still a custom in these countries to sell by auction for considerable sums, which are devoted to charity, the honour of reading aloud in the Temple on the Sabbath a short passage of the sacred scriptures. However naïve or barbaric such a custom may appear to a West European, it nevertheless proves what value rich Jews attach to intellectual fame.

In any case the religion and philosophy of a people can scarcely be adduced as a means of defining the "unalterable" qualities of a nation because many communities in the course of their development seem to abandon their original "national" religion for another. To-day the religion of the Aryan prince Buddha prevails more in Mongolian than in Aryan countries. Christianity, deriving from Judaism, is practised in Aryan countries and the Turks are the principal supporters of the religion of the Arab Mahommed. It is not only the prophet but also his doctrines which are more appreciated in other countries than his own.

The conclusions of the racial doctrine, as Hauck, the founder of the German faith, says in his *German Vision of God*, are based much more "on intuitive vision than on reason". Such a method, which consists in depicting for emotional reasons a nation full of the virtues prized by the nationalist author, often leads to the amusing result that the picture of a nation drawn by its admirers may be applied by every Jingo to his own nation. For a scholar of this type, the German nation will have exactly the same enviable qualities as a Jew would give the Jewish people. Thus the ethnologist, Lapouge, with the approval of Günther, the apostle of the Nordic

religion, who differs from him only in a single unimportant point, praises a particular race as follows: "The . . . has great needs and is indefatigable in his efforts to satisfy them. He has greater aptitude for acquiring riches than for keeping them: he accumulates them and loses them easily. Full of enterprise he dares everything and his boldness assures him incomparable successes. He fights for the sake of fighting but never without the idea of an advantage at the back of his mind. Every land belongs to him and the whole earth is his home. His cleverness is capable of considerable development and varies from plodding thoroughness to creative genius. . . . He is logical when that suits him and is never satisfied with empty words. The desire for progress is the most powerful urge within him. . . . In civil life he only demands that the State respect his activity, and he is more interested in rising himself than in crushing others. He recognises his advantage from afar and likewise that of his nation and his race, whom he boldly prepares for the highest destinies. He believes he will soon be the undisputed lord of the world and his boundless audacity, his powerful imagination and his sense of the solidarity of his race ensure him the greatest likelihood of success."

Must not everyone who reads these lines think that they are written by a chauvinistic Jew, perhaps even one of the sinister "Sages of Zion" to glorify his race? Do they not characterise the majority of Central-European Jews? Are they not to be distinguished according to other racial authors from the calm and sober Nordics by their ostentation, their love of luxury and their untiring efforts to satisfy their growing needs? Is it not true of a certain type of Jew, the speculator and stockbroker, that he is better able to acquire riches than to keep them, that his tendency is to accumulate them and then to dissipate them? Is it not strange that all the Jewish bank-directors at the beginning of the crisis lost not only the money of the banks which they managed but also their own in spite of their great incomes, and that the German-Jewish post-War multi-millionaires like Castiglioni, Michael, Barmat and Bosel made and lost their fortunes with the same rapidity? All speculators—therefore a large number of Jews—fight for the sake of fighting but "never without

an idea of profit in the background". The portrait given by Lapouge sums up in the form of a eulogy all the reproaches which were usually levelled against the Jews of Central Europe. Their greatest desire is to get on, the life of the nation only interests them inasmuch as it furthers and does not hinder their efforts. They recognise their advantage from afar, consider each state as belonging to them and the whole world as their home over which they hope soon to rule.

But it is not the Jew who is thus praised by Lapouge. On the contrary, it is the dolicho-cephalic, the forerunner of the Nordic, according to the racial creed.

It is not only this schematic formulation which makes the racial doctrine such an uncertain science, it is also the peculiarities of its terminology which makes every psychological phenomenon a good quality or a defect according to the term chosen. This is what makes the study of the doctrine of a racial soul so difficult, because each definition of a trait of character carries at the same time a judgment of value which varies according to the sympathies of the author who uses it. Thus treachery sometimes becomes a holy egoism, loyalty spiritual rigidity, the love of solitude an anti-social tendency, cowardice may be called a fanatical love of life, courage before a recognised authority may be defined as subversive audacity, the humility of the martyr may become servility. Love of property is sometimes gross materialism and ruthless pillage heroism of the Viking type. The eternally human destructive instinct which awakes from time to time in all nations, in all races and in all social communities becomes in descriptions of the Nordic soul "bright power" and cruelty in the Orientals. The desire for independence, when meant as praise is love of liberty, but when used as blame, anarchy. The spirit of submissiveness is discipline amongst the German peoples and servility amongst the Orientals. "Has one ever heard of a racial theorist," says Huizinga very truly, "who considered his own race as inferior?" It is certain that if a racial prophet were to depict the Jewish race his terminology would be very different from that of Lapouge. The Jew, fighting against a majority, would not be termed courageous or audacious but insolent. In his reasoning

he would not be "logical when it suited him" but calculating. As a speculator he would not be "enterprising for the sake of a possible profit" but a monster of cupidity.

To show to what extent this double terminology with regard to the same moral qualities falsifies unconsciously, or perhaps consciously in view of the sacred aim they are pursuing, the judgment of the racial prophet, two examples may be cited from the *Myth* of Alfred Rosenberg which is recognised officially, together with *Mein Kampf*, as the fundamental work of the Third Reich. According to him, in the history of the Czech Hussites, "the Alpino-Dinaric character is revealed by barbaric cruelty allied with incredible superstition. . . . A consideration of Czech history is extremely instructive for the whole future of the racial study of history and shows how carefully we must distinguish liberty from "liberty". Liberty in the Germanic sense is inner independence, the possibility of research, the elaboration of a philosophy, true religious feeling; liberty for the races of the Near East and dark cross-breeds means the complete destruction of the cultural values of others." In the German Peasant Wars, in which 100 years later the German peasants left not one stone upon another, murdered, raped and burned, and after their defeat were slaughtered by the German nobles in the same way, we have a good example of the creative cultural power of the Nordic. "The one-eyed and raving Zizka von Trocnaw, whose head in the National Museum of Prague proves him to have been an Alpino-Armenoid, was the first expression of this Taborite movement which was utterly destructive": and, as the direct antithesis of this anti-Nordic and blood-thirsty mongrel we have the gentle kindness of Luther, begging the German princes to hang and slay and flog the unfortunate peasants wherever they could be found. Instead of stating simply that in all nations, the German as in the Czech, fanaticism, whether religious, national or social, makes atrocities appear a duty, this method presents the same facts as cruelty in the one case and the heroic conception of life in the other.

"Ignatius Loyola," says Alfred Rosenberg in the same work, "demands the same thing in his famous letter on obedience: blind

obedience", and he calls Loyola's exhortation: "Lay down your freedom, beloved brothers, as far as possible and give up and sacrifice your liberty. . . . You must obey with a certain blind impulse, eager to let yourself be carried away and to do without question what your superior orders" an "open challenge thrown down to the whole conception of spiritual life in Germanic Western Europe." It is of course open to discussion whether the influence of the Jesuit doctrine on the European mind should be described as disastrous—although it must not be forgotten that the Jesuit, Friedrich von Spee, was the first to oppose the witch trials and, displaying remarkable freedom of mind, saved the lives, the health and the honour of thousands of German women. But it is astonishing to learn a few lines later that he who embodies the idea of liberty as distinct from the blind obedience of the Jesuits is the Prussian soldier. "The Prussian soldier was subjected to a severe discipline from the technical point of view, but inwardly he was free." Friedrich Wilhelm I, the father of Frederick the Great is, according to this, the German genius who, in contrast to the Basque Loyola, developed the inner freedom of the Nordic soul in the person of the Prussian soldier by recruiting everywhere in his own States and in others, by trickery or by force, unfortunate tall young men who were forced to run the gauntlet a dozen times for every attempt at escape and even for the slightest breach of discipline. The inner freedom of his soldiers was respected, although they had to marry according to his orders and not to their own wishes. He was thus, to a certain extent, the theoretical founder of German eugenics. Frederick the Great saw the Prussian soldiers with other eyes: "Our regiments," he says in his *Instructions to My Generals*, "consist half of my own subjects and half of foreigners who serve for money. The latter have nothing which binds them to us and therefore seek only an opportunity of escape" and continuing he describes as one of the first duties of a general the prevention of desertion and gives twelve rules for this of which the first is "not to pitch camp too near a wood if circumstances do not make it necessary," from which it appears that the Jesuit who freely obeys his superior is a slave, while the Prussian soldier of the eighteenth century, this un-

fortunate machine of the most brutal despotism, is a free man. The expert racial theorist can make the same psychological quality into opposites simply by giving them different names: by this method of evaluating differently the same qualities he may be able to boast of having invented a new political instrument but not of having served the truth.

A hundred and fifty years later in modern Germany the open challenge to West Europe which is supposed to lie in Loyola's desire for blind obedience seems no longer to be felt as such. "I am the captain of the Ship of State," says the Führer in one of his speeches, "and you are my crew and I demand absolute discipline and obedience. I allow no revolutionary spirit." Germanic loyalty and Jesuit submissiveness are as like as two peas except for the name. Even the sacrifice of liberty of thought, the preliminary censorship of the Catholic Church, the *imprimatur*, which every Catholic priest must obtain before publishing a work, is part of the policy of the Third Reich. On the first page of most National-Socialist books appearing at present in Germany the words are found as in Catholic books: "No objection is made to the publication of this book by the N.S.D.A.P. The President of the Official Examination Board for the protection of National-Socialist literature." And Alfred Rosenberg had undoubtedly to make an intellectual sacrifice for the unity of a great idea when he had a German review immediately suppressed in which a Catholic priest pointed out very discreetly some of the errors of his book. For what may be termed intellectual servility in the case of the Syrio-Roman papacy may also be called "liberty of defence against subversive ideas".

But not only these subjective elements—the tendency to schematisation and to applying standards of value—make it difficult to ascertain the characteristic spiritual qualities of a community, but equally the nature of the object of study itself. Most ethnological psychologists start with naïve assurance from the principle of the unalterability of national character. How many descriptions are there of the German soul, the French soul, the Jewish soul and how few who point out any evolution of the national character? Actually the collective soul of human communities changes in

many ways more and much more rapidly than its physical characteristics.

A complete revolution of the spiritual mode of life is possible—and it is just this which makes the Jews recognisable and makes them the object of hatred and suspicion for the National-Socialists—which has nothing whatever to do with anatomical changes or any other physical alterations. Brehm, a valuable authority, says that the blackbird about a hundred years ago was a timid and solitary bird living in the woods whereas to-day, for unknown reasons and without any change in its physical constitution, it has completely changed its character and has become a quarrelsome inhabitant of the towns. Similarly according to Colin Ross and other witnesses, the Australian vulture, once sheep-raising had been introduced into Australia, suddenly became a bird of prey living exclusively or at least preferably on the kidney fat of the sheep. Human communities also undergo modification without any apparent physical appearance, so that it is the soul which modifies the body and not the body the soul.

Who would have believed eighty years ago that Japan, that solitary nation, driven out of its moral and material isolation only by the bombardment of three great powers, would become the Mongolian variety most eager to acquire Western knowledge and develop an Imperialist mentality which would threaten these very powers? A just but unforeseen revenge for having been disturbed in its secluded life. Macaulay, who was an excellent observer, said that cowardice was an Irish weakness. A few years later the bravest regiments of the British Army were composed of Irishmen and even to-day the New York police, one of the bravest in the world, includes a very large proportion of Irishmen. At present we see Italy, under the influence of Fascism, display a discipline unknown in that country since the fall of the Roman Empire, and the German nation, without changing physically, give up under the influence of its leaders its character of productive man—of which the German scholar, modest and objective, at present deprived of all influence, was formerly the symbol—for the sake of a theatrical mentality athirst for glory and swayed by rhetoric to an extent which would not have been dreamt of a century and a half ago.

This evolution of the moral physiognomy of a people, which may take place in a relatively short time, is sometimes due to historical accident, sometimes to the influence of foreign ideas, sometimes to the profound impression made by individual personalities who may not have sprung organically from the spirit of the nation prevailing till then but may change it by combating it.

The invasion of the Spanish adventurers completely and permanently changed the character of the South American Indians at the same time as it destroyed their states and civilisation. Christian ideas are transforming at this moment the native civilisation of the Negroes of Africa, just as formerly, according to reliable authorities, they helped the Germanic tribes to organise themselves into states. A single man and a foreigner, Napoleon, gave a direction to the psychological evolution of the French nation so that his influence is still visible to-day.

Further, every judgment on the moral qualities of a nation is usually an average judgment applying to a social class which at the given moment seems to be representative of the community. If this class loses its influence the national character obviously changes. The apparently typical German virtues, such as discipline, and long-suffering fortitude, were originally not virtues of the entire German people but of the Prussian officers and soldiers whom fate made the first of all the professions and the model for all the other non-military classes. As for the essentially French qualities, such as wit and intellectual vivacity, they correspond to the psychological structure of the man of letters raised by Voltaire to the leading position in the nation. If Bismarck had been defeated in Germany, which is by no means inconceivable, and the bourgeoisie had been victorious, other virtues would now be considered national virtues of the Germans, just as the love of glory, a national virtue during the Napoleonic era, is no longer typical of the French mentality, after a century of bourgeois government. Even when it seems impossible to question the absolutely fixed and distinctive character of a nation there are always a number of its members who do not share these characteristics and an even larger number who only imitate them. Thus, circumstances having changed, the

German nation of "thinkers and poets", to the great astonishment of the world is transformed into a nation armed to the teeth, contemptuous of all ideology, and the conservative Spain of three centuries changes in the eighteenth and nineteenth into a country convulsed by revolutions. It is not that the character of the individuals has changed but other personalities, whose spirit was also present formerly, now impose on the nation their distinctive features.

That is why the Nordic so frequently offers, according to the racial authorities who admire him, qualities which are absolutely contradictory. According to Lenz, "the Nordic is one who lives least for the moment; he surpasses all races in perseverance and foresight". Roese, on the contrary, maintains that "the Nordic tends to work in bursts, preferring to alternate periods of intense effort with periods of relaxation or complete laziness". Sometimes "exaltation is almost painful to the Nordic" (Günther), at others, his supreme moment is "the inner joy of giving himself without reserve" (Claus). According to Lenz, "self-control, foresight, self-respect and respect for the life and property of others, saves the Nordic from breaches of the Law". Claus, however, finds that he resembles the hawk—a symbol of the free robber—"who swooped on the dove and destroyed the degenerate kingdoms of the South for amusement, because the strength of his sword urged him to it". Arthur Dinter maintains that love of his neighbour is characteristic of the Nordic. August Hoppe, formerly press chief of the Hitler Youth, considers on the contrary that such love is anti-Nordic: "Free yourself," he advises the youth of Germany, "free yourself from the Jewish, Christian ideas of sin, pity and loving your enemies. Accursed be pity and kindness, praise be to all that makes one hard in order that we may without emotion see die the evil descendants of better ancestors."

It is obvious that all these contradictory judgments are not false despite their apparent contradictions. Diligence may be considered a national German virtue if one takes as the typical representative of the Nordic race or of the German nation the German scientist or technician whose perseverance does actually seem to surpass that

of other nations in the same field. But if the German *lansquenec* or the German as described by Tacitus be taken as the embodiment of the German soul, in whom periods of great laziness followed periods of great effort, it is intermittent activity which is the characteristic of the German. According as one takes the period in which the German officer impressed his standards of life and his ideal on the nation, or the troubadour, or the warrior servant of God, like Luther or Zwingli, or the philosopher, the German people present a completely different moral appearance. The portrait drawn by Madame de Staël of a religious and philosophical community, lacking all idea of domination, of a highly cultivated but materially primitive people, was absolutely correct. It described the German soul of 1820 but not that of 1930, just as the purity of morals praised by Tacitus was contradicted a few centuries later by the annalist of the Merovingians, Gregory of Tours.

The principle of the invariability of national qualities and the doctrine which sees all virtues in one community and all vices in another being obviously false, many intellectuals prefer to cling to the inheritance of humanism which denies all national characteristics or considers them as of no importance for the judgment of the individual. According to them, the nation is a psychologically uninteresting abstraction whereas the higher or lesser value of the individual is alone important, whatever nation or community he belongs to. Annette Kolb, a German writer of half-French origin, relates a charming story which shows to what extent humanism still dominates cultivated minds. A young girl asked an old and worthy Englishman if he loved the French, then if he loved the Germans and finally if he only loved the English, and receiving in every case a negative answer she exclaimed: "Then you don't love anybody?" and he replied: "Oh yes I do, I love my friends."

But although this gentle wisdom is right in thinking that national and racial characteristics cannot be the supreme standard for judging the human value of an individual, it is nevertheless unable to explain social phenomena. National qualities exist and are of decisive importance in explaining the outbursts of hate and the

conflicts between human groups. In describing national characteristics one must clearly not believe in their invariability nor allow oneself to be carried away by the natural impulse to glorify one's own group. The method employed at present in German racial science or in nationalist Jewish literature (which consists of finding in the actions and the ideas of the Nordics and the Jews of bygone ages, in the Edda or the Old Testament, the elements of the present mentality of the Germans and the Jews for the purpose of leading the people of the present degenerate age by these great examples towards the realisation of their true nature) leads to fantasies which may be of great political influence but not to any knowledge of the real characteristics of human communities. Even if it were absolutely proved—which may still be doubted—that, as Clauss contends, the God of the Nordic and the Nordic himself are solitary, the modern German, even if he possessed more Nordic blood than German racial science actually claims for him, does not love solitude, but on the contrary, is one of the most perfect and most highly-disciplined types of group member known up to the present in civilised nations. Similarly the fear of God, which characterised the ancient Jews for all readers of the Bible, exists so little amongst modern Jews that not a trace of it is found either in their actions or their talk or their business: in the pictures of a Liebermann, in the poems of a Hofmannsthal, in the music of a Gustav Mahler it will be sought in vain. If, therefore, one wishes to describe the national differences existing to-day and their characteristic symptoms, there is only one method of doing so. It is to give a picture as free from subjective prejudice as possible, not of an eternal and unchangeable mentality but of the present mentality of the Germans and of the German Jews. It may prove that many of these characteristics are of recent origin whereas others may have remained constant, throughout the centuries.

This mentality cannot be characterised in the simple manner employed to-day by attributing certain qualities, for instance, bravery, love of independence, chastity, to one community and denying them to the other. The important thing is the totality of psychological constitution within which these universal human

qualities manifest themselves and which give these same human qualities a different significance. Personal liberty was the essential of life for a man of the Renaissance and meant more than fatherland, religion, family or any community. Liberty had therefore for him a completely different significance from what it had for a German of the Wars of Independence or for a German of our day who desires to shake off the fetters of the Versailles Treaty. What for him was an end in itself is here only a means towards a future Germany whose ideal is not the free individual but an organised community. A writer may also be courageous unto death as Emil Zola showed, but for him courage was not an end in itself. His aim was truth. In a chivalrous society, on the other hand, bravery is not a means but an end in itself. The chastity of an unattractive woman may be the form of life which suits her seeing that she must be content with it; that of a strong and much desired man may be an heroic struggle for the realisation of a monastic ideal. Qualities as such characterise an individual just as little as they do a community: only when their total spiritual tendency has been recognised can one understand the significance, sense and the value of the separate qualities.

CHAPTER SIX

The Psychological Evolution of the German Jews

The impossibility of characterising a human community in terms of universally human qualities and weaknesses, such as bravery or cowardice, patriotism or egoism, cupidity or idealistic contempt of money, extravagance or avarice, is nowhere more clearly shown than in a study of the psychology of the Central European Jews. Within this group itself such contrary virtues and vices have been exhibited at the same time by different individuals that they might easily be considered as typical representatives of both. For nothing is more false than the persistent tendency of anti-Semites to consider as specifically Jewish certain kinds of intellectual activity.

If the shameless attitude of a section of the daily press formerly controlled by the Jews, the ruthless exploitation of personal tragedies for the sake of sensation or money—which is unknown for instance in the Swiss press—be regarded as something specifically Jewish, it must not be forgotten, on the other hand, that the greatest opponent of this abominable plague, long before the National-Socialist Revolution, was not an Aryan German but the Jew Karl Kraus. The most unjust and violent war-song of 1914 in the German language was written by a Jew, Lissauer's "Song of Hate" against England; but H. Fried, a Nobel prize-winner who preached pacifism when it was not yet fashionable, was also a Jew. During the War there were many Jews who, as pacifists, were bad patriots. But one of the few really moving popular songs of the time, the Austrian Cavalry Song, is also by a Jew, Zuckerman, who realised it by his death. The assassin of the Jewish socialist Eisner, President of the ephemeral Soviet Republic of Bavaria was a half-

Jew, Count Arco-Walley. Many well-known Communist leaders were Jews, but the name of the woman who shot Lenin was Dora Caplan. The Stock Exchange and capitalistic speculation are considered by many Germans to be the natural element of the Jews. Yet the great opponents of this spirit of speculation, at a time when in Germany there was practically no resistance to it, were the Jewish socialists Marx and Lassalle, and the bourgeois Jew, Edward Lasker, was the only one who even before the crash of 1873 demanded the most severe measures against the Stock Exchange swindles at the beginning of the Empire.

If the composers of the most stupid modern Viennese and German operettas were Jews, who thus compromised the musical tradition of Germany, the man of genius who revived the operetta and raised it to the level of an art was also a German Jew, Jacques Offenbach. Daniel Spitzer, the brilliant musical critic, and many others combated the music of Richard Wagner, but it was also the Jews, including, amongst German professors, the literary historian, Michael Bernays, who welcomed the appearance of this music and fostered it, as they did every real event in German music during the past sixty years, often long before the Germans. At a time when the majority of German theatre-directors regarded Wagner's work without interest or comprehension, the Jew Angelo Neumann, one of the most interesting producers of his time, though in a rather isolated post in Prague, made him known by first-class productions. In the nineties, when I was living in Vienna, the city of music, to be a Wagnerite and a Jew was more or less one and the same thing amongst Viennese youth. From the very beginning Jews were admirers of the German-Aryan modern musicians who have gained a European reputation, of Richard Strauss and Alban Berg. Arnold Schönberg who, in contrast to the manufacturers of Jewish operettas, was the most solitary of composers and perhaps for that reason exerted the most profound spiritual influence, was a Jew. Corruptors of the theatre like the brothers Rotter were Jews, but not only Max Reinhardt whose ostentatious productions were considered anti-German, but also Otto Brahm, the director of the simplest and most sincere theatre which Germany

has ever had, the champion of Ibsen and the discoverer of Hauptmann, were likewise Jews. The extravagant style of life of some Jewish financiers and bank-directors, both in Austria and Germany, is counterbalanced by the simple life of the majority of Jewish scholars. Blüher, an outstanding National-Socialist writer, considered that Spinoza's life was a model for every race. To-day the courage, the humanity, intelligence and genius of Sigmund Freud are a model of human dignity in a degenerate age.

The strange nature of the Jewish collective soul to-day might be described in one sentence as follows: *The Jews of Western and Central Europe always display the virtues and vices of the peoples with whom they live raised to a higher power.* It is just this capacity for producing in certain of their members the virtues, and in others the vices of the nations in which they live and producing them on a grand scale and each more or less in isolation, which apparently constitutes their "distinctive racial characteristic" and not single specific virtues or vices, talents or deficiencies. That is why the philo-Semite can support his view with as many proofs as the anti-Semite. Indeed, this capacity leads to such grotesque results as that the most intelligent and most fanatical anti-Semites are to be found amongst the Jews themselves, who, in this connection also, raise to the level of a philosophy the likes or dislikes of the people who have accepted them. What Christian philosopher would ever have attempted to demonstrate so thoroughly the abysmal depravity of the Jewish mentality, and to make of it a drama affecting the whole of humanity, as did the Jewish philosopher Otto Weininger, for whom the Jew, even more than woman, was the embodiment of the devil on earth, the absolute negation as such?

Many examples prove that the Jews to-day embody in the most typical manner the most contrary qualities and defects of the nations in whose midst they live—a fact which confirms the old, rather vague proverb according to which "Every country has the Jews it deserves." Thus the Magyars are perhaps amongst all the nations of Europe the most patriotic, only the Hungarian Jews are even more radically chauvinistic in their love for Hungary than the Magyars themselves. Only a few weeks ago I heard a

Jewish Hungarian industrialist warmly praise the National-Socialist Revolution, which had just resulted in the expulsion of dearly loved relatives from Germany, from the conviction, which inspired his whole speech, that only the new ideas of invincible Germany could repair the grave wrong done to Hungary by the Treaty of Trianon.

In Austria, where the population with its attractive gaiety has the weakness (due probably to its artistic temperament and the long influence of a pomp-loving Court) of living beyond its means, the Jews were even more carefree and extravagant than the Austrians themselves. Under the monarchy their greatest ambition was to imitate as closely as possible the style of life of the Court and of the Austrian nobility. Ischl, the summer residence of the Emperor Franz Josef, therefore became quite naturally the summer resort of the great Jewish bourgeoisie. (As a favourite Viennese song puts it, they tear a limb from the world and pay for this pleasure with their last shilling, careless of the fact that the mutilated world can only be repaired with the greatest difficulty.) In 1924 the losses due to speculating in the franc were due in no small measure to the efforts made by these leading Jewish classes to maintain a standard of living beyond their means.

On the other hand, in Switzerland where the German, French, Italian and Romanish populations rival each other in thrift, where the tradition of a poor and mountainous country is still so vital that prodigals in all classes of the population are great exceptions, the Jews in contrast to their fellows in Austria are even more penurious in their habits than the Swiss themselves. Swiss Jews differ morally more from Austrian Jews than Swiss Christians from Austrian Christians.

The Germans educated in the Prussian tradition combine frequently with their technical powers and their extraordinary ability for organisation, a lack of charm and an arrogance which make it difficult for other nations to like them. The same qualities in an exaggerated form may often be found amongst Prussian Jews. Amongst their intellectuals the card-index erudition of a Maximilian Harden was a striking example, which appeared again in a

cruder form in the tendency to mock at everything, characteristic of many Jewish journalists; and this same arrogance explains the audacity of certain Jewish speculators who, far from concealing their wealth, paraded it by extravagant expenditure. Even to-day Englishmen and Frenchmen, eager to help the unfortunate Jewish refugees, sometimes complain that they, still in love with their old country, criticise rather tactlessly the country which receives them by making comparisons with the marvellous organisations of their German fatherland.

If the population of the United States is naturally optimistic and inclined to speculation, the Jewish stockbrokers of New York are even greater gamblers. If the French merchant is thrifty, not to say stingy, the French Jew is often in a greater hurry to retire and the Parisian Rothschilds were the only members of the family who were not touched by the crisis, because they had given up business altogether. In the Dreyfus affair, the only supporter of Dreyfus who shared all the prejudices of the military caste and of the anti-Dreyfus party, was none other than Captain Dreyfus himself. The cant of a rich English Jew is even more excessive than that of a member of the High Church, just as Disraeli grotesquely exaggerated in his youth the snobbishness of his most arrogant aristocratic colleagues. Even the fanatical mysticism of the Russians, which one would imagine to be unknown to the Jewish community so often decried as rationalists, is frequently found in an intensified form amongst Russian Jews. Trotsky was always more absolute and pitiless in his destructive sectarianism, more unwilling to give way on any point of his Bolshevik Utopia, than Lenin or Stalin.

In the same way the best minds amongst the Jews represent the virtues of the nations which received them. No one was more erudite, no one less interested in money and honours, no one has embodied more completely the virtues of the German scholar, his world-remote conscientiousness and his intellectual cares, than the Jew Rudolf Eisler, the author of the best philosophical dictionary existing in any language, who in spite of this tremendous achievement neither desired nor obtained any post and died as

quietly as he had lived, without receiving any official honour. If the German capacity for organisation has made the Germans the model nation in this respect, no one realised more completely—in his work and in his writings—the principle of organisation for the benefit of the entire nation than did Walter Rathenau. What composer reflects more completely the fresh sensuousness and the whole temperament of Southern France than the half-Jew Bizet in his immortal *Carmen*? What writer revealed more completely in his life or work the wit and keen intelligence of the true Frenchman of our time than the half-Jew Anatole France? Few English politicians can be mentioned beside Disraeli as a living symbol of conservative, radical and Imperialistic England. In Denmark in the midst of the Nordics, the Jewish poet Hermann Bang embodied the gentle and yet somewhat bitter loneliness of the Danish soul, and Georg Brandes, the utter and pitiless sincerity of the Danish mind which enables the Danes almost alone among the nations to admit their political weakness and seriously to pursue a pacifistic policy.

A particularly noteworthy example of this peculiar ability of the Jews in Central Europe to be leading representatives of the most diametrically opposed sentiments and ideas is provided by the history of the German political parties. All German parties with the exception of the Centre party were founded by Jews. The legend that the Jews in Germany only belonged to and were the leaders of the radical parties is obviously false. Friedrich Ludwig Stahl, Professor of Constitutional Law and creator of Prussian Political Science and of the Prussian Upper House, was the founder and for many decades the leader of the Prussian Conservative Party. The Jew Rudolf Friedenthal, Prussian Minister for Agriculture under Bismarck, and Otto Arendt, one of the initiators of the German colonial movement, played a decisive part in the secession of the Independent Conservative Party from the extreme Conservatives. The National Liberal Party was founded and directed for many years by Eduard Lasker, the Left-Liberal Progressive Party by Ludwig Bammerger. Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle created German Social Democracy. The leader of the opposition to radical

Marxism with the Social Democratic Party and founder of the moderate Socialist Revisionists was Eduard Bernstein, while on the other hand, Rosa Luxembourgh in the Communist Party, and Eisner in the Independent Socialist Party, played important parts. That is, the leading representatives, of the Conservative, Liberal and Socialist schools of thought were all, without exception, Jews. Even Duesterberg the organiser of the Stahlhelm after the victory of the racial creed—is of Jewish descent.

This power of embodying in single individuals contrary philosophies and qualities of character in an extreme form, this ability to produce at one and the same time idealistic minds of outstanding power and great organisers and unscrupulous swindlers in the economic sphere, is however, astonishingly enough, anything but an old-established characteristic, but seems suddenly to have been acquired by the German Jews only at the end of the eighteenth century. It is a striking result of a transformation in character which occurred in the German-Jewish community almost from one day to the next at the end of the eighteenth century, and constitutes one of the most curious phenomena in the intellectual history of the nineteenth century. This abrupt change, together with the psychological evolution of the German nation during the same period, seems to be the ultimate cause of the boundless hatred at present displayed against the Jews.

For centuries before that the Jewish community, which is now broken up into countless independent individuals of contrary tendencies in every field, exhibited a strikingly uniform character. Its members differed of course in talent and achievement, but not in their views and general style of life. They were traditionalists who could only be compared with the Chinese of before the Chinese Revolution and the exact opposite of what they are to-day. Every Central European Jew of the seventeenth and eighteenth century in Germany was a rigidly conservative clericalist who submitted with intense fervour not only to the spirit but to the most minute regulations of a religion which more closely resembled a ritual than a living faith. Every human relationship, "the most intimate as well as the most external, was strictly governed by traditional com-

mandments, dictated thousands of years ago by a despotic God and handed down in the sacred scriptures or even more by oral tradition. Typical of their attitude is not the fact that discussions as to whether an egg laid on a feast day could be eaten or not were possible, but the intensity of such discussions; nor that a commandment laid down the exact weeks between the menstrual periods during which conjugal relations were allowed, but that any breach of this commandment was considered a grave sin involving heavy penalties. Two sets of cutlery were obligatory, one for meat, the other for "milky" foods and, in order to observe the most subtle interpretation of the law that the kid should not be cooked in the milk of its mother, they had to be kept separate and never allowed to come into contact with each other under severe penalties. Breach of this law was a sin more deadly than any crime, so that, according to an old Jewish joke of the period, a Jewish murderer abandoned his nefarious plans at the last moment because he had by mistake picked up the "milky knife", which it was forbidden to dip in blood. Even to wear different clothes from the rest of the community was sufficient ground for expulsion. An old Jew told me himself that in 1850 when, after a trip abroad, he had given up the caftan and adopted "German dress" his mother mourned him as lost and recited the prayers for the dead. Living in the traditions of long-past ages, all Jewry ecstatically celebrates every year its liberation from the Egyptian danger three thousand years ago and the end of the Babylonian captivity two thousand years ago. The days of mourning were not in memory of the expulsions and pogroms of a few decades earlier but the anniversary of the destruction of Jerusalem seventeen hundred years ago. It should be noted that at that time not a single European nation celebrated any historical event by a public festival, whereas the Jews on the other hand with unprecedented tenacity linked all their festivals with historical memories.

The intellectual uniformity of the German-Jewish community was even more remarkable than its traditionalism. The whole of the intellectual life was confined to the synagogues, to the "schools", in which nothing but religious texts were interpreted with

incredible subtlety—again and again, and always on the basis of the ancient oral and written tradition—texts, which can only be compared, not with sacred scriptures, but with *corpus juris*. There was no room for philosophy, for science or for the arts—with the exception of certain didactical religious poems or psalms. This intellectual sterility was due neither to their being excluded from Western culture nor to their confinement in the ghetto—for the Jews were nowhere prevented from taking up in their own cultural centres the sciences and the arts of the peoples amongst whom they lived and still less from developing a philosophy, a science or an art of their own. It resulted from their style of life, devoted as it was exclusively to the service of God, and which made them consider the interpretation of the divine commandments as the only occupation worthy of the mind. Until the end of the eighteenth century, this style of life was permeated with a spirit of the most profound submission to and dependence on the will of the tyrannical and incomprehensible God of Israel combined, however, with the tremendous pride and the feeling that they were the Chosen People. To serve was humiliating but to serve God raised the Chosen People above the freest of the nations which received them. Pride and humility were inseparably blended.

It is true that religion also affected all spheres of activity in the European nations so that even their economic forms were decisively influenced by Puritanism or Catholicism, as was shown by Max Weber, one of the last of the free intellects amongst German scholars, in his studies in religious sociology. But the style of life typical of the Jewish community, this state of a spiritual theocracy, had long been unknown to them. Canon law certainly established rules of action for the Catholics of all countries and demanded that they should be obeyed everywhere and always, but even before the Encyclopaedists and the wave of atheism of the eighteenth century, it only affected in practice the marriage laws and the ecclesiastical regulations as such, whereas the Talmud interpreted by the Rabbis directly controlled every field of life. Ubiquitous and jealous of the least of his commandments, the Divine Legislator exercised a daily jurisdiction over the food, the conjugal relations

of his people, over what they should read and write, over their dress and behaviour. There is an extensive Jewish literature going back more than a thousand years and dealing with the question how many commandments God had imposed on His people in their daily life, and Maimonides gives the number as 613, 365 prohibitions and 248 positive commandments, which figures signify according to Juda ben Simon: Each day speaks and says to man: "I beg thee, do not break this law on me"; and every member of the body speaks and says to man: "I beg thee, use me to carry out this commandment." In the European nations the study of theology or deistic philosophy still ranked above natural science, astronomy or the practice of profane art, but still naturalists, astronomers and profane poets did exist. For the Jews however of this period the Divine Scriptures were not the centre of life, but life itself. The mere observation of any part of nature, even the writing of a love-song without reference to God, was for them something inconceivable.

The German-Jewish community was the most uniform, the most traditionalist and the most rigid of all the Jewish communities. Amongst them were not to be met, as amongst the Western Jews, such rare exceptions as Uriel d'Acosta or Spinoza who had freed themselves from the views and the habits of the community. Similarly the strong and vital movement of Jewish mysticism was represented in Germany according to the reliable Jewish historian, Dubnow, by foreign Jews, chiefly Poles. Even at the end of the eighteenth century the philosopher Salomon Maimon in Berlin was turned out of a Jewish home when his intention of studying the natural sciences became known. The state of mind of the German-Jewish intellectuals at this time and throughout the preceding ages was that of the hermit in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* who, remote from men in the solitude of the wood, accomplished by songs and laughter, by tears and complaints, the task of his life, which was to glorify the God which was his God. This traditional uniformity, this ancient and curious mental attitude of the German-Jewish community, which seemed absolutely fixed, disappeared suddenly when its leaders discovered what Zarathustra

had not wished to reveal to the hermit for fear of troubling his peace of mind, namely that God was dead. It would seem that both philo-Semites and anti-Semites do not recognise the importance of this psychological event which completely transformed the character of the German Jews. It is however the key not so much to the solution of the Jewish problem in the twentieth century but certainly to its history in the nineteenth.

Whatever value be placed on the Enlightenment as an historic event which was much more important for the transformation of the character of the German Jews than the political emancipation which in most German States only took place decades later, whether the criticism of religion be considered as an advance or a retrogression of human society, the fact remains that in consequence of this movement the Jewish intellectuals, until then educated solely in the knowledge of God and obedience to His commandments, suddenly discovered the richness of the surrounding world and at the same time the decrepitude of their Divine Despot.

Obedience to the many commandments—which till then had constituted the innermost kernel of their being—disappeared and they found themselves liberated from all bonds, thrown back upon themselves and in possession of an intellectual liberty which in the history of the human mind was only equalled by the restrictions from which they had been delivered.

Formerly the Divine Sovereign had determined uniformly the morality, the form of knowledge, the style of life, even every minute of daily existence, the eating and drinking, ambition and love of the entire mass of the Jews. Now, this centre having disappeared, each individual found himself obliged to live according to his own strength and his own abilities, to seek a personal morality and personal reasons for living, to find a place in which he could exist. The rigid and uniform community was replaced by an agglomeration of human atoms with all the advantages and all the faults, for themselves as well as for others, which were bound to result from such a state.

What an enormous difference between the number of outstanding Jewish personalities in the hundred years preceding the religious

emancipation and in the hundred and thirty years which followed it until the National-Socialist Revolution! Dubnow, the most conscientious historian of the Jewish community, who had definite leanings towards orthodoxy and a marked repugnance towards being assimilated, does not mention in the eighteenth century before the Encyclopaedists a single German-Jewish poet, not a philosopher or musician, not a scientist, not even a single important doctor, although the Jews seemed formerly, and in particular within the Arabian culture, to have had a natural aptitude for medicine. Even in the domain of Jewish theology uniformity and traditionalism of thought had resulted in sterility. In a period of a hundred years Dubnow only mentions two outstanding Rabbis of German-Jewish origin, Bacharach and Emden. Otherwise, it was "Jewish Poland which provided Germany with Rabbis and Talmud scholars." Graetz, the second well-known Jewish historian, though much more superficial, mentions the existence of Jewish poets in Italy and Holland at this time but considers only one Rabbi of German-Jewish origin as worthy of note.

On the other hand, the anti-Semite *Handbook on the Jewish Question* by Fritsche, gives in its 36th edition no less than 264 writers for the following 130 years, including amongst them such first-class authors as Heine, Boerne, Auerbach, J. J. David, Wassermann, Kraus, Altenberg, Hofmannsthal, Schnitzler, Beer-Hoffmann, Werfel, Kafka and Arnold and Stephan Zweig. In contrast to the earlier period in which, despite the cultivation of religious music, no outstanding musician was to be found, the following composers appear, some of them already in the next generation: Meyerbeer, Felix Mendelssohn, Offenbach, Mahler and Schoenberg, to say nothing of lesser lights such as Halevy, Moscheles, Hiller, Schreker, Goldmark, Kurt Weil, and the leading authority on musical theory for many generations, Bernhard Marx. The list of Jewish celebrated practising musicians in the *Handbook* is so great that one is tempted to believe that the author here displays philo-Semitic tendencies. Although he only quotes well-known virtuosos, the list comprises about a hundred names, including amongst the pianists Thalberg, called the Paganini

of the piano in his own day, Rubinstein, Moszkowski, Rosenthal, Arthur Schnabel, Godowski, Alfred Grünfeld and Wladimir Pachmann; amongst the violinists, Fritz Kreisler, Huberman, Milstein, Mischa Elman, Sascha Heifetz, Josef Joachim, Arnold Rosé and Jehudi Menuhin; among the violincellists, Frederic Buxbaum, Heinrich Grünfeld, and David Popper, to say nothing of the countless well-known singers. It mentions as conductors of the first class Hermann Levy, Leo Blech, Gustav Brecher, Oskar Fried, Klemperer, Felix Mottl, Bruno Walter, Siegfried Ochs and thirty others. These are only quoted as examples because "the list of Jewish conductors is simply endless" and one of the greatest conductors of all time, Arthur Nikisch, cited as a Jew in the 28th edition, appears to have been left out perhaps by mistake or because his Jewish descent could not be proved. The influence of some of these men was anything but ephemeral, as is so often the case with executant artists. As a conductor, Mendelssohn re-discovered Bach for the German nation, and Mahler revived Wagner's operas with such profound insight, only through him did the following generation learn how classics can be kept alive.

In the plastic arts where for centuries the commandment: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth or that is in the water under the earth" had stifled all production, the painters Liebermann and Lesser Ury in addition to numberless minor talents—the 28th edition cites 43 names—were famous as painters and pioneers. In architecture the Jews had created nothing original for two thousand years, a fact which is used by the Handbook as evidence of their artistic impotence, but the architect, Alfred Messel, whom the National-Socialist circles, ignorant of his origin, proclaimed as late as 1931, the most original German architect, was a Jew, as also was Erich Mendelssohn, the leader both in theory and practice of the modern German School, and Leo Nachtlicht, the prize-winner at the Exhibition of Architecture in Berlin, in 1931. Against the complete insignificance, indeed nullity, of the German-Jewish scientists in the eighteenth century, of thirteen Jewish winners of the Nobel Prize ten were of German-Jewish

extraction (Baranyi, Mayerhof, Einstein, Löwi, Ehrlich, Michelsohn, Lippmann, Franck, Haber, Willstätter) and of four half-Jewish winners, two were German Jews (Baeys and Warburg). Technology, formerly foreign to the Jewish spirit, owes to it the following world revolutionising inventions: the radio valve (Robert von Lieben), the idea of the motor car (Siegfried Marcus), the idea of the dirigible (David Schwarz), perfected and realised later by Zeppelin, the gramophone and the telephonic transformer (Emil Berliner) and electro-metallurgy (M. H. Jacobi). Amongst the innumerable famous German-Jewish doctors some made sensational discoveries: Neisser discovered the gonococcus, Koller the use of cocaine, Wassermann the diagnosis of syphilis by the reaction of the blood, Edmund Weil the sero-diagnosis of spotted fever, of which he died after injecting himself. Ehrlich's "Salvarsan", discovered after the most painstaking experiments, which has made syphilis a curable disease, is therefore only one of the discoveries pointing to a complete change in the Jewish mentality. That does not prevent the anti-Semite *Handbook on the Jewish Question* from denying all productive activity in this field to the Jews, with the sole exception of Ehrlich. "I fully recognise," says the author of the chapter on medicine, "the works of a Cohnheim and of a Weigert in pathology, of a Henlein in anatomy, of a Frenkel and of a Besredka in bacteriology but all the same the Jews have not produced a Paracelsus, a Robert Koch, a Behring or a Rudolf Virchow." Unfortunately the review *German Health from Blood and Soil*, which publishes the medical ideas of Streicher, the most influential German leader after Hitler in the Jewish question, pointed out later that these three Germans had been so far polluted by the Jewish mentality that they should be regarded as Jews: "The idea of polluting human blood by an animal serum is so typically Jewish and fits in so perfectly with Jewry's plans for world domination that we regard the work of Behring, that is, the whole scientific foundation of serum-therapy, as a pure intellectual construction and the statistics of its successes as pure lies. . . . Under the cloak of an exact science a vast action for polluting German blood has been carried out on a large scale for

decades. Emil von Behring was a plague centre, by means of his invention the blood of innumerable German comrades was mixed and poisoned with animal serum. Out with all foreign poisons from German blood! Down with the Jewish medical idols Virchow, Koch and Behring." It would seem from this that, contrary to the view of the Handbook, the Jews had produced the discoveries of Koch, Behring and Virchow, not by blood but by their spirit, and in the case of Robert Koch it cannot be denied that he was discovered and assisted by the Jew, Ferdinand Cohn, the leading botanist of his age.

For the purpose of this book, which is to discover the causes of the present war of the Germans against the Jews, it is a matter of indifference whether, accepting the view of believers in the Nordic race and the non-existent German blood, the achievements of the German Jews in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries be regarded as pernicious or used to establish the injustice of the present German measures. The indisputable fact of the astonishingly large number of cases of outstanding activity in all intellectual fields provided by the German-Jewish community in the nineteenth century compared with its sterility in the eighteenth, is only used here as a proof of the change in its psychological structure which, together with the equally radical change of the German national character during the same period, constitutes the prime cause of the present conflict. Only to describe this radical alteration in the whole mentality of the German Jews and not to indulge in pointless criticism or praise is the list of important personalities continued here. It is taken from writings both hostile and friendly to the Jews, and contains only the more important names recognised in their particular branch of science.

Among astronomers may be mentioned: Wilhelm Beer, the brother of the composer Meyerbeer, who gave the first complete description of the moon and whose work was crowned by the Academy of Science in Paris; Maurice Löwy, a German Jew, who was in charge of the Paris Observatory, directed the work for a photographic map of the heavens and whose methods for determining aberration and refraction are still in use to-day; Karl

Schwarzschild, who while still at school invented a method of determining the path of double stars and whose work on the movement of the fixed stars made him one of the leading astronomers of his time; Hermann Goldschmidt who—first merchant, then painter and finally astronomer—likewise found in Paris his new home, discovered there in the course of nine years the fourteen small planets and was crowned eight times by the Academy of Science.

The number of Jewish mathematicians in the nineteenth century is almost incredible and they include mathematicians of the first rank. Amongst the twenty names given by the *Jewish Lexicon* are to be found: Georg Kantor, without whose foundations of the theory of quantities modern mathematics cannot be conceived; Ludwig Kronecker, the creator of the modern theory of numbers, whose collected works were published after his death by the Prussian Academy of Sciences—a rare event in science, in which usually the results of a life are quickly out of date; Hermann Minkowski, who elaborated the mathematical basis of the special theory of relativity; C. G. J. Jacobi, the founder of the so-called Königsberg School, whose work forms the basis of the theory of elliptical functions. The existence of so many geniuses in the service of such a world-remote science, playing a leading part in the establishment of the bases of modern science, does not prove any special ability of the Jews for this type of activity—which would certainly have revealed itself much earlier—but rather the extension of their psychological horizon. At the same time as a great number of Jews saw in material prosperity, in gambling on the Stock Exchange and in speculation the meaning of life, Jewish astronomers and mathematicians appear as symbols of a mentality and a temperament fundamentally opposed to it.

Contradictory traits of character may have the same source. Avarice and prodigality, love and hatred, contempt for and love of the world, have often the same psychological roots. Often the materialistic tendencies of the parents produce idealistic reactions in the children. A psychologist might conclude from the simultaneous appearance of outstanding Jews in the world-remote sciences of

astronomy and mathematics and in the worldly activities of the Stock Exchange that both phenomena have their origin in a certain relation of the German Jews in the nineteenth century to money and the power of money. What appears in the latter as an unbridled instinct might be explained as a sublimation of this instinct in the case of the scientists, as a psychological phenomenon of the second order. Such a hypothesis would sound very clever but would be incorrect, for in other fields of knowledge, by no means so world-remote as mathematics or astronomy, the same surprisingly large number of distinguished Jews is to be found. In chemistry the following may be mentioned: Liebermann, who produced alizarin as the first artificial dye and thus laid the foundations of the German Dye Industry; Heinrich Caro, the discoverer of analine red, Manchester brown, methylene blue and the phosgene dyes; Nicodemus Caro and Adolf Frank, the inventors of the potassium nitrate process for the production of artificial manure, without which Germany could not have carried on the War even for two years—Adolf Frank was in addition the founder of the German Potash Industry; Fritz Haber, the organiser of the chemical industry, whose method of obtaining synthetic ammonia from nitrogen and hydrogen was awarded the Nobel Prize, who invented the fire-damp whistle to prevent coal mine catastrophes, and who was in addition one of the leading thermal chemists; Willstätter, another Nobel Prize winner, investigated the nature of chlorophyll and of haemochrome, was the greatest German authority in the field of organic chemistry while at the same time his research work on the assimilation of carbon dioxide made him one of the foremost physiologists of plant life; two other chemists, George Lunge and Ludwig Mond, should likewise be included amongst the German-Jewish chemists on account of their German-Jewish descent and the fact that they studied in Germany; the former who worked in Zürich, was one of the leading analytical chemists of his time, invented the nitro-meter and the gas volume-meter and laid the foundations for the manufacture of soda in Europe. The other, born in Cassel, discovered a method of recovering sulphur in the manufacture of soda, further Mond gas a fuel for motors, iron and nickel carbonyl as a means

of obtaining chemically pure nickel, and combining scientific and business ability, he made his factory the centre of the chemical industry of England of which his son, later Lord Melchett, became the leader. Darmstätter, together with Dubois-Reymond, the author of a history of natural science and technology, introduced the use of sulphuric acid on potassium. Maurice Traube invented the semipermeable membranes which first made possible a study of the osmotic pressure of liquids. Two Jews, Paul Jacobson and Victor Meyer, published a Handbook of Chemistry, the standard work used by German students of chemistry for two generations. Meyer's methods for determining the density of steam by air pressure is still employed and his work on the constitution of the derivatives of benzole and ammonia is still valid.

No less surprising, because in such striking contrast to the Jewish lack of interest in all natural phenomena, is the appearance of great physicists amongst the German Jews in the nineteenth century. As early as 1842 P. T. Riess, a non-baptised Jew, became a member of the Prussian Academy of Science, thanks to the influence of Humboldt, for his work in the field of friction electricity. Hermann Aron invented wireless telegraphy for short distances—he was the first to send electric signals and to speak from one bank of the Wannsee to the other—invented the incandescent lamp and the electric meter. Heinrich Hertz established experimentally the identity of the nature of light and of electricity, Gustav Hertz the correctness of the modern theory of ions; Eugen Goldstein who, because he was a Jew, could not obtain a chair at any university, and consequently any help from the State, demonstrated the deviation of cathode rays and the persistence of colouring produced by these rays on colourless bodies, discovered the canal rays and was the first to succeed in an experimental reproduction of the movement of comets. Albert Michelson (a German Jew though working in America), whose famous experiment shook the foundations of physics and became the origin for Einstein's theory of relativity, established that the speed of light in the direction of the rotation of the earth was the same as the speed at right angles to that rotation, and was awarded for his work the Nobel Prize. James Frank, Nobel

Prize winner in 1926, expanded by means of model experiments the modern atomic theory developed by the Danish Jew, Niels Bohr (Frank was treated as a traitor by his colleagues at the University because at the beginning of the National-Socialist Revolution he courageously protested against the expulsion of the Jews from the German nation and the denial of their services to Germany). Gabriel Lippmann from Luxembourg, but of German origin, discovered the principles of colour photography and invented the capillary electrometer. V. M. Goldschmidt, another Jew of German origin, Professor of Minerology in Norway, established on the basis of physico-chemical research the relation between the structure of the atom and crystalline form and deduced from it a new theory of the structure of the earth which created quite a stir. The works, of the Munich physicist, Arthur Sommerfeld, *The Theory of the Top*, and *Atomic Structure and Spectrum Lines* are, according to the experts, two of the most remarkable works of modern physics. In view of the large number of outstanding Jewish physicists it seems rather surprising that Albert Einstein is the only one usually mentioned.

Several authors have tried to explain the number of Jewish mathematicians, astronomers, chemists and physicists by a special aptitude of the race for abstract speculation. Such a contention, however, is refuted by the number of leading Jewish scientists in fields devoted to the study of life and not to "inanimate nature". To mention only the most important names in these fields of knowledge, which for ten centuries did not attract a single Jew, the German Jews produced the following botanists: Julius Sachs, one of the founders of modern plant physiology; Ferdinand Cohn, who succeeded in establishing the plant nature of bacteria and who, in the opinion of one of his admirers, established the fundamental unity of all forms of life by destroying the wall between botany and zoology; and Nathan Pringsheim, the discoverer of the existence, formerly denied, of sexuality in the lower plants, who was also one of the first to explain the functions of chlorophyll.

In addition to these theoreticians, mention may be made of Paul Aschersohn, the best botanist of the flora of his home in Branden-

burg; the physiologist, Otto Mayerhof, Nobel Prize winner for his work on the transformation of muscular energy; the biologist Richard Semon, whose doctrine of the "Mneme" as the principle of psychical continuity in the stream of all organic phenomena was the first attempt not yet obsolete to explain the inheritance of psychological qualities; Jacques Löb who, after he left Germany, carried out most successful experiments with the artificial incubation of non-fertilised eggs, and was at the same time the discoverer of ionisation and the biological importance of electrical qualities; Eugen Steinach, who published studies on change of sex and rejuvenation, which are considered by some to be full of promise, by others of no value, but on which no final judgment can yet be passed.

In physiology alone Teilhaber cites twenty German-Jewish outstanding scholars, including many of the first rank, such as Ludwig Budge, known for his studies on the function of the pneumogastric nerve and the spinal cord; Romberg, founder of pathological physiology and neurology, who discovered the early symptoms of tabes; Hermann Munck, creator of the physiology of the brain; Julius Bernstein, who explained the physiology of muscles; Ludwig Traube, the forerunner of modern scientific thermometry, who made digitalis an indispensable remedy in heart treatment and whom many consider as the founder of the systematic scientific method which placed Germany in the forefront of medicine for many decades.

This same spectacle, a disconcerting abundance after a period of absolute sterility, is provided by the German Jews in the humanistic sciences. Not only are they admirably represented in disciplines bearing no relation to Jewish tradition but they are the symbolic representatives of the most contradictory currents. In Germanic and Indo-Germanic philology, for which fanatics of race or tradition might think the German Jews had no aptitude, the author of the first dictionary (it is still in use) was a Jew, Daniel Sanders. The author of the first sanscrit grammar published in England was Theodor Benfey, a Jew, who is cited as a witness by one of the spiritual fathers of the National-Socialists, H. St. Chamberlain,

when he speaks of the special aptitudes of the ancient Hindus for philology—saying that “only the ignorant could deny the competency of Theodor Benfey on this subject”. Jacobson, whose collaboration in the linguistic atlas of Germany (which takes account of the slightest local changes) was important both from the scientific and national standpoint, was a Jew; so also was Hans Sperber who, together with the Norwegian Falk, created historical semantics which endeavours to establish relations between the evolution of the meaning of words and the intellectual currents of each epoch. Samuel Singer is the historian of borrowed words and of the cultural relations which result for the different nations from this linguistic inter-penetration.

As for literary history and Germanic philology, which were as remote from the Jews as Sirius is from the Earth, Friedrich Gundolf may be named, a disciple of Stefan George and the most influential professor after the War. His funeral at Heidelberg just before the National-Socialist Revolution was that of one of the spiritual leaders of the Germans. Whole sciences were created by the Jews in Germany, of which there is no trace in Jewish tradition, as for instance, mass psychology by Lazarus and Steinthal, synthetic anatomy (Heidenhein), criminal anthropology (Maurice Benedikt), the history of the sexual sciences (Evan Bloch), neural physiology (B. Stilling), the pathology of the skin (Unna), the doctrine of periods (Fliess), scientific hydrotherapy (Wilhelm Winternitz), psycho-analysis (Freud), the pathology of plants (Paul Sorauer), paleography in its application to history and the history of art (Ludwig Traube) and even the attempt at a world language is due to the Jew Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto.

But however important these achievements—whose value or otherwise is of no concern here—for the contrast in the German-Jewish character before and after the Enlightenment, for the sudden change, seldom before observed, from complete sterility to abnormal feverish productivity, even more characteristic is perhaps the fact that in each of these sciences Jews often embody the most diametrically opposed trends. The anafchical state of mind of a community which till but a short time before had been so rigidly

uniform is clearly expressed in such oppositions. In this connection law offers amazing and convincing examples.

It may not seem strange that the number of important German-Jewish jurists in the nineteenth century is legion, as here tradition may play a certain part—the sharpening of the mind on the problems of the Talmud, the equivalent of the *corpus juris*. But it is astonishing to note that Jewish lawyers are far from sharing the same fundamental conceptions—as would have been a matter of course for the Jews of the eighteenth century—but are the leading representatives of different and conflicting trends within this branch of learning. Thus the historical school found its most violent opponents in Eduard Gans, the author of *The Law of Succession in its Historical Development*, based on Hegel's philosophy, and in Friedrich Ludwig Stahl whose theories of jurisprudence and constitutional law, at a time of national speculation and historical research, made Christian legitimacy the unshakable foundation of the State, and thus provided for many decades the theoretical basis for the Prussian State. On the other hand, however, Landsberg, the incomparable author of the *History of German Jurisprudence* was also a Jew, likewise Jacobson, who wrote an excellent three-volume history of the Prussian Civil Service, Ferdinand Frensdorff, the editor of numerous sources of German law, and above all, Lenel, who succeeded in re-establishing the text of the Roman Edictum perpetuum, a monument of historical penetration and German industry.

Jews were also amongst the leading theoreticians of German jurisprudence, of a positivist school which opposed both the extreme historical and the philosophical trends. It included Josef Unger, who revised Austrian Civil Law, Behrend, L. Goldschmidt and Grünhut, who founded the German science of commercial law, Laband and Georg Jellinek, the constitutional authorities of Bismarck's time, Rosin the first and, until to-day, the most important theoretician on national insurance, and Ehrenberg, whose theories still constitute the unshaken foundation of the law of private insurance.

In addition to these theoreticians there were practitioners whose commentaries are so indispensable even now in racially pure

Germany that their works have to be used in the lowest as in the highest courts and were still quoted until a short time ago. These include the Commentary on Commercial Law by Staub, on Civil Law by Stein-Jonas and on National Insurance by Stier-Somlo. Further, in addition to the German-Jewish legislators, Heinrich von Friedburg, the author of *German Criminal Law*, Julius Glaser, the author of *Austrian Criminal Procedure*, Hugo Preuss, who inspired the Weimar Constitution, there were also their opponents in the theoretical field, the leaders of the Liberal Movement in Law, Fuchs, Kantorovitz and Eugen Ehrlich, who were also Jews. The latter again were opposed by Kelsen, another Jew, who sought to re-introduce the most abstract of juridician theories, the doctrine of pure law, and who—strangely enough, though it is typical of the psychological disintegration of the Jewish race—in spite of his researches in this field so remote from positive law, codified the short-lived Austrian Constitution of 1919.

Political economy presents the same features contrary to the popular view which, in consequence of the great influence of Marx and Lassalle on the Germans, only knows Jewish scholars in this field as representatives of radical socialistic theories. Böhm Bawerk, the most subtle and learned representative of the Viennese school, who founded the Theory of Marginal Value, was a half-Jew. Jews also were Ludwig Mises, the most brilliant defender of Free Trade and bitter opponent of socialist controlled economy, and Carl Grünberg, the historian of the liberation of the Austrian Peasants. Many of the German-Jewish national economists who were more sympathetic to socialism were not Marxists but energetically strove to refute orthodox Marxism. Thus Bernstein was the founder of revisionism, Franz Oppenheimer the eloquent advocate of an original form of agrarian socialism, at present being tested in practice, and finally Josef Popper-Lynkeus, physicist, poet, author of a biography of Voltaire, and also of a programme for compulsory national feeding, an idea which was first considered by National-Socialism, which knew nothing of its originator, as a revolutionary invention of the new Germany.

What a profusion of creative individuals, and at the same time

what a complete loss of the traditional uniformity of outlook and conviction! What independence of life and ideals in each single member of a community formerly so conservative and homogeneous. Important figures appear in single families in numbers which formerly the society as a whole could not boast. There are seven Warburgs of whom one (Aby) was a well-known historian of art and the founder of the Hamburg Library for Cultural Sciences; one a physicist (Emil), president of the physico-technical Institute and through his *Handbook of Experimental Physics* one of the most suggestive teachers of his science; one a chemist (Otto), to whom we owe the explanation of the chemical changes in carcinoma; one a botanist (Otto), known for his researches on tropical plants; and three bankers of whom the first, Max, the owner of the Warburg bank, played an important part as financial adviser of the German government in the re-establishment of the relations between Germany and America after the War, while the second, Paul, is one of the directors of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and the third, Felix, became a director of the firm Jacob H. Schiff, New York, all three difficult to dissociate from the financial life of the present time. There are four Minkowskis, each a celebrity in his field: a psychiatrist (Eugen), eminent for his work in schizophrenia; Mieczyslaw, one of the leading anatomists of the brain at the present time; Hermann, formerly mentioned as the one who provided the mathematical basis for the special theory of relativity; Oscar, a specialist on internal disease, and who discovered diabetes of the pancreas. Eight Pribrams are famous, a pathologist, an historian, a surgeon, a serologist, a national economist, a radiologist, a chemist and a specialist for internal diseases. It is as though each German-Jewish family wanted to make up for what it had missed throughout the centuries and at the same time, having a premonition of what was to happen in Germany, to make the fullest use of the short time at their disposal.

And what an additional proof for the transformation of the Jewish soul in Germany within barely a century, and at the same time for the width of its horizon though also of its disintegration, lies in the fact that in chess, the acrobatics of the mind, the world

champions were German Jews for nearly fifty years (Zuckertort, Steinitz, Tarrasch, Schlechter, Lasker), while in the most diametrically opposed activity, boxing, they became so prominent that in 1934 they held world-championships in four weights, and the heavy-weight champion, Max Baer, the cruiser-champion, Max Rosenbloom, the light-weight champion, Barney Ross, and the feather-weight champion, Jackie Brown (all of German-Jewish origin) appear as brilliant refutations of the belief in the innate physical inferiority of their race which a few generations earlier was justly considered beyond question. Truly, this sudden appearance of so many first-rate minds in every field from within the German-Jewish community gives the impression of a star which, deprived for a moment of its cohesive force, explodes into thousands of fragments (each of which in a burst of flame follows its own individual path like a comet) and scatters its light on all sides in the very moment of its destruction.

This evolution of the Jewish character may equally be seen in the economic field, although certain scholars, Sombart in particular, have been inclined to see in the influence of the Jews on German economy in the nineteenth century the effect of traditional aptitudes and age-old activities.

It is true that already in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Jewish factors at the various Courts had to fulfil important financial duties, which is comprehensible on account of the dislike of the ruling class for financial affairs and their consequent inability to organise them. Samuel Oppenheimer of Heidelberg became in 1674 contractor to the Austrian Army and Imperial factor. As such he organised the food supply during the siege of Vienna and in the following Turkish wars, and acted generally as intendant. His successor, Samson Wertheimer, was for thirty years (from 1694 to 1724) the financial adviser of three emperors and created various State monopolies, which, like the salt monopoly in Austria, are still in existence. At the same time the Jew, Jost Liebermann, attached to the Court of the Elector of Prussia, was employed as the principal army contractor and organiser of credit. Frederick the Great made use of Veitel Heine Ephraim for the debasement of the

currency and farmed out to him and his brother-in-law Gumpert during the Seven Years War all the Prussian mints. Daniel Itzig shared with him the doubtful honour of financing by all sorts of means the Seven Years War. Behrend Lehmann of Halberstadt, the Court factor of the kings of Saxony, procured the money necessary for the election of August II to the throne of Poland, and the best known on account of his death but not the most remarkable of these financial magnates was the Jew Süß (Josef Süß Oppenheimer) who, Minister of Finance in Wurtemberg, was responsible for the abuses there. In addition to these particularly outstanding finance agents, the number of Jews influential in finance and in particular among the army-contractors was so great that the historian Moscherosch in the seventeenth century could say with a touch of exaggeration: "All Jews are commissarii and all commissarii are Jews." And the Rothschilds began by following this tradition.

Nevertheless this economic activity of the Jews—whether it be approved or not, it was indispensable to the rulers of the nations amongst whom they lived—the only activity which they had exercised in Germany throughout the centuries, differed fundamentally in its character from the activities in the following period. Until then they only showed initiative in the task imposed upon them by their rulers just as in their religion they were the chosen slaves of a Supreme Power. Hence their activity was confined solely to finance and to war supplies—in the traditional and unchanging forms, more as contractors under compulsion than as free producers and dealers. A few decades, indeed a few years later, they had freed themselves from all tradition and in the economic field also independently developed great activity as manufacturers, organisers of great businesses, speculators, railway builders, sometimes with beneficial, sometimes with disastrous, results, but always producing a large number of strong personalities.

There is no question here of describing the enormous influence of the Jews on the economic development in Germany in the nineteenth century, which tends to be exaggerated both by anti-Semitic authors like Sombart or philo-Semites like Arnold Zweig

or Zielenziger. All that is aimed at is to show that, just as in the sciences, their activity was not derived from any tradition and that the choice of activity in any given case is unexpected and without relation to the habits of the family. Thus in navigation, for which Jews since the earliest times have never shown any interest, two outstanding personalities are to be found: Albert Ballin, the organiser of the Hamburg-American Line which, thanks to him, became the greatest shipping company in the world, and Wilhelm Kunstmann, who founded the most important private German shipping company which had the same importance for the fame of the German flag in the Mediterranean and in South America as Ballin's work for trade with the United States. Coal-mining, a branch of industry which is not even mentioned in the *Jewish Lexicon* because so completely unrelated to Judaism, attracted the Jewish industrialists of the nineteenth century to such an extent that it may be said without exaggeration that the whole mining industry of Silesia owes its origin and its development completely to the Jews. David Friedländer opened the Minerva mine, his son Otto the Heinitz mine and the iron works "Julia", the largest in Upper Silesia, Heinrich and Aloysius Kern, the "Hermine" iron works and Fritz Friedländer the Upper Silesian coke works. The Petscheks were, until recently, the masters of the German lignite and briquette industry. Finally, Eduard Arnhold, until his death the coal-king of Germany, the only Jewish member of the Prussian Upper Chamber, and the real coal-commissioner of Germany during the War, succeeded in uniting the coal producers in Upper Silesia and thus tripled production. He symbolises in addition the multiplicity of interests of the Jewish mind in the nineteenth century compared with the uniformity of its tastes in the eighteenth, because he was a great art connoisseur and collector, and bought pictures by Menzel, Boecklin and Liebermann at a time when they were not highly thought of. And the same man was an authority on railway freights, and one of the founders of the Friedrich-Wilhelm Institute.

The taste for experiment and adventure—a trait absolutely new in the German-Jewish community, formerly so rigid and conserva-

tive—made certain of its members creators of new branches of science and founders of new industries. Moritz van der Porten introduced into Germany the manufacture of aluminium, Gerson the large-scale production of ladies' dresses, Leonor Reichenheim and Meyer Kaufmann coloured textile weaving. Benno Orenstein and Arthur Koppel were the pioneers of light railways. Arthur and Karl Weinberg took part in the foundation of the dye industry. Ludwig Loewe was the greatest arms manufacturer in Germany, the head of an industry which one would have thought repugnant to Jews unaccustomed to weapons for centuries. The porcelain industry should have been equally disliked by the Jews who in the eighteenth century were not its masters but its victims, because by a decree of Frederick II they were compelled to buy as a form of tax the products of the royal factory, an obligation which seemed humiliating to them. Nevertheless a Jew of Prussian origin, Philip Rosenthal, on his return from America, founded the greatest porcelain factory in the world.

The frenzy with which German Jews exploited all the inventions of the nineteenth century is typical of the change which had taken place in their collective soul. If, for the Jews of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, every novelty as such represented more or less a sacrilege, in the nineteenth century, on the other hand, all those with any talent seemed to be fascinated by everything new. Emil Rathenau, together with the German Siemens, organised the electrical industry. In aeronautics David Schwartz was the forerunner of Zeppelin, a Jew, Karl Arnstein, constructed the Zeppelin III, the first dirigible to fly across the Atlantic, and in Austria two Jews, Wiener and Rumpler, played a decisive role in the building up of the Austrian Aeroplane industry. The influence of German Jews is even greater in the development of railways, the most revolutionary invention of modern times. It is so great that it seems as if imprisonment for centuries in the ghetto had produced a positive love for railway speculation, operating as it did in terms of countries, and for the construction of railways as a means of abolishing all frontiers. When the building of railways seemed the most hazardous of speculations, the Rothschilds, together with the

Bleichröders, financed numerous railways in Germany and more or less all of them in Austria. Two speculators on a large scale, Stroussberg in Germany and Ofenheim (who took the title of Ponteuxin when raised to the nobility in Austria) later continued this policy of radical innovation when enthusiasm had died down in consequence of the crisis which followed the Crimean War. The former planned and financed the construction of numerous railways in Eastern Germany, amongst others the lines between Königsberg and Lyck, Berlin and Goerlitz, the railway on the right bank of the Oder and the Brandenburg-Posen railway, while the other financed the Austrian railways in Galicia. Despite the existence of the railways, in part completed and in part initiated by them, they are not known to economic history as railway builders, but Stroussberg, after his financial downfall—likewise brought about by a Jew, Eduard Lasker—as the prototype of the swindling company promoter, and Ofenheim, on account of his remark in the course of his trial that railways could not be built with moral adages, as the type of courageous financier. The history of these men proves even more than the object of their interests that even the character of the German Jews changed during the nineteenth century. To realise this it is worth while examining this point a little more closely.

The Stroussbergs and the Ofenheims of the 1870's and the Jewish speculators after the War by no means embody the attitude of all Jews in industry and finance. Others just as brilliant abstained on principle from all speculation and all doubtful financial affairs. In railway construction, for instance, there was Julius Berger, who built the railways of the Rhineland, planned and constructed in part the first Persian railway, fifteen hundred kilometers long, built with others the metropolitan railway in Berlin, whose shares were considered gilt-edged and carried large dividends. He built with such economy and skill that Switzerland, though always distrustful of foreign contractors, gave him the order to build the large tunnel in the Jura which was finished only during the War.

In the world of finance, Karl Fürstenberg, the director of the Berliner Handelsgesellschaft, was opposed on principle, even during

the inflation period, to all forms of speculation, in contrast to his Jewish colleagues on the boards of other banks who contributed by their extravagant projects to the undermining of their banks. Many of the speculators who played a disastrous part in the years after the war of 1870 and in Austria at the time of the speculation in the franc, were Jews. On the other hand, the most violent and successful opponents of the financial swindles which preceded and followed the Stock Exchange crash of 1873 were the Jews Lasker and Bamberger, and after the speculation in the franc it was the half-Jew, Victor Kienböck, who put the Austrian finances in order, first as Minister of Finance and later in an even more difficult position as President of the National Bank.

Here as in all other fields what is so striking is the many-sidedness of the German-Jewish soul both for good and evil, and the sharp contrast in which it stands to its earlier uniformity. It is sufficient to know the character and the manner of doing business of any one important financial agent of the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries to know those of all the others. In their private lives overbearing and servile, arrogant and pious as belonging to the "elect", the chosen servants of God or of kings, in their business affairs they were, above all, concerned with security, a fact partly due to their historical evolution, Jewish finance having arisen out of loans on security, and partly to their historical situation which compelled them, as the weaker and more threatened party, both legally and politically, to be extremely suspicious and to adopt special precautions. Hence amongst them are not to be found the types who in the nineteenth century played such a prominent part in the economic life of Germany—the speculator on the one hand and the financial organiser on the other.

Undoubtedly there were also usurers amongst the Jews of the nineteenth century, Shylocks who, trembling for their money, the sole security of their life, desired to grow wealthy without risk. But they do not typify the role of German Jews in the financial economy of Germany before the National-Socialist Revolution. The characteristic representatives, on the contrary, were absolutely new types in Judaism: the speculator, the adventurer who controls

millions one day and is penniless the next because gambling, the continual challenge to fate, had become his idol: and side by side with him, equally new and important, the productive Jewish economic organiser less interested in amassing a fortune than in building up a business, less interested in money than in creative enterprise. When Sombart states that out of twenty-five private German banks of the first rank, sixteen were Jewish, out of sixty-five founders of North German textile undertakings twenty-seven were Jews, that out of sixty-seven North German chemical factories, twenty-two, and out of fifty-four Berlin breweries twenty-seven were founded by Jews, the transformation of the German-Jewish character in its attitude to money from the conservative usurer, anxious for security, to the speculative company promoter and productive business man, becomes particularly clear. And there are countless intermediate types between these extremes, between the pure speculator for whom the business as such is nothing but gambling and power everything, and the organiser of the highest principles whose life, like that of Ballin's, is inseparably interwoven with the fate of his enterprise and ends with its collapse.

The situation of German Jews with regard to journalism is equally significant for this change of character, this evolution from uniformity towards anarchic diversity. The nations amongst whom the Jews lived possessed, it is true, few newspapers before the nineteenth century and these papers were of no great importance. But there were chronicles, annals and pamphlets whose function was to note, criticise and disseminate the events of the day. The Jews, however, displayed not the slightest interest in this work—a fact which is all the more astonishing as they possessed the largest number of people able to write and Jewish printing establishments had existed from the earliest times. Valeriu Marcu in his book on the expulsion of the Jews from Spain mentions the fact that “the Jews have not written any chronicles for ten centuries since their expulsion from Palestine, and that, although scattered over the whole world, they take no notice of the world”, and he attributes very correctly this lack of historical records regarding their own fate and that of their environment to their orthodoxy and their studies

of the Talmud which completely dominated their lives and "influenced them more than the fauna, flora and conditions of work of the regions which they inhabited". It is true that from the Middle Ages on, Jewish memoirs and martyrologies kept a record of their scholars and of the victims of pogroms, but they did so, not for purposes of expansion or polemics, and still less to transmit historical knowledge, but simply and solely as a means of honouring their ancestry. Only the epistles which constitute an important part of the Jewish literature were destined for publication although written in the form of private letters, but as a rule they contained only discussions on scientific matters and nothing about the events of the day. Before the Enlightenment there existed no Jewish pamphlets: "Whereas the press in Europe," according to the *Jewish Lexicon*, "owes its origin to the pamphlet, nothing is known of a similar forerunner of the first Jewish paper." On the contrary, without any previous tradition or development, Moses Mendelssohn published the first Jewish paper in 1750, so that it is quite obvious that Jewish interest in journalism was a revolutionary phenomenon which appeared simultaneously with the birth of Rationalism. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Jews in Germany showed no special inclination for the intellectual activities required for the pamphlet, the chronicles and later for journalism and still less any specific aptitude for this type of occupation. It was not a question of dislike on their part but simply complete indifference.

Scarcely a generation later Jews created not the German newspaper but German journalism, which may be distinguished from the spreading of mere information by the attempt on the part of the journalist to comment upon the event from his own standpoint. Heine might be called the father of the *Feuilleton*, Börne the father of the leading article. Reuter, a Jew from Cassel, created the type of the modern news agency, whose most important representative in Germany was the Jew Bernhard Wolff, the founder of the semi-official Wolff's Telegraphic Bureau (W.T.B.). Oppenheimer, a Jew born in German Bohemia and working very successfully in Paris, invented the interview. The advertisement, the financial

backbone of most papers, was popularised in Germany almost exclusively by Jewish publishers amongst whom Mosse and Ullstein were the best known but by no means the only ones. As regards the proportion of Jews engaged in journalism in Germany before the National-Socialist Revolution the *Jewish Lexicon*, which tends rather to minimise their share in its article "Journalism", mentions more than 200 influential Jewish journalists, including many whose names have escaped the oblivion characteristic of daily production, such as the Viennese critic Saphir, omnipotent in his day, Rodenberg the editor of the *Deutsche Rundschau*, Kalisch the founder of the most typical of Berlin satirical papers, *Kladderadatsch*, Max Nordau and Theodor Herzl, who later founded Zionism but who were first feuilleton editors, Maximilian Harden, Theodor Wolff and countless others. The anti-Semitic *Handbook on the Jewish Question* with the definitely opposite tendency of magnifying the participation of the Jews in German journalism, cites 300 newspapers and journals which, to judge by the names of the editors and proprietors, were in the hands of the Jews and amongst them not only the most popular papers in Berlin, whose circulation in certain cases exceeded 400,000, but, in contradiction to the account given in the *Jewish Lexicon*, also many of the provincial journals which enjoyed considerable influence, such as the *Dresdner Nachrichten*, the *Breslauer Zeitung*, the *Königsberg-Hartungsche Zeitung*, and the best literary reviews, such as the *Neue Deutsche Rundschau*, the *Deutsche Rundschau*, *Nord und Sud*, *Westermanns Monatshefte*, the *Uhu*, and the *Literarische Echo*.

Here, where we desire to show not, as in the first chapter, why the Germans in consequence of their psychological peculiarities, abandoned the control of the press largely to the Jews, but why the Jews, contrary to their tradition and without any obvious specific aptitudes, were able to take over that control, their journalistic activity provides a further instance in support of the contention that, just as in the economic sphere, they no longer display the former uniform traits of character but rather resemble individual atoms. Many Jews founded gossip papers which for the sake of sensational news unscrupulously revealed the private lives of both

men and women. But equally many Jews founded extremely conscientious and well-informed dailies not to be influenced either by money or any other advantage. Side by side with Jewish financial papers encouraging speculation there were many independent and competent economic reviews likewise edited by Jews. Instead of a wearisome enumeration of names it will suffice to quote here in proof the most famous corruption lawsuit of post-War days, which the founders of the *German Economist* and the *Austrian Economist*—two reviews which as regards probity and competence could stand comparison with the best English economic journals—brought against the editor of the *Börse*, Emmerich Bekessy. In this suit the two plaintiffs and the defendant, together with the four lawyers and even the judge were all Jews. One party defended the view that the newspaper is an enterprise which sells its articles to the highest bidder, while the other maintained that the honesty, liberty and independence of the press were the foundations of national order and wellbeing. Who could have imagined a hundred and twenty years earlier, in view of the disinclination of the German-Jewish community to discuss all contemporary questions, that three generations later the fundamental and decisive problem of the press would be fought out publicly by Jews?

It is true that consideration of the Jewish share in German journalism may give rise to the opinion that one of the old characteristics of the German-Jewish community manifests itself in the manner of their journalistic activity; not their traditionalism and unity of moral character but the uniformity of intellectual outlook, as all German-Jewish journalists were Liberals and Democrats. It must be pointed out that this reproach so often made by National-Socialists and scarcely denied by the Jews themselves—if it be a reproach—is not justified in such a sweeping form. A certain number of prominent journalists of Jewish origin, such as Moritz de Jonge, for many years the influential editor of the Conservative *Kreuzzeitung*, Otto Arendt, the press chief of the Free-Conservative Party and Adolf Grabowsky, co-founder of the political review, the *Zeitschrift für Politik* and founder of "Cultural Conservatism", were not Liberals. Many Jews also supported the policy of the govern-

ment whatever it was, amongst others Gustav Heine, Freiherr von Geldern, the director of the official *Wiener Fremdenblatt*, the mouth-piece of so many Austrian cabinets (he was the brother of Heinrich Heine, which is a further indication of the spiritual divisions even within Jewish families) and his colleagues, von Frydmann and Löbl. In addition to these conservative and government journalists, there were until 1880 innumerable German-Jewish journalists of note who were fanatical pan-Germans and anti-Slavs, as, for instance, Ignaz Kuranda, editor from 1848 to 1866 of the East German *Post* and a declared opponent of all concessions to the Slavs in Austria, or David Kuh, the founder of the German-National Liberal Party in Bohemia. Nevertheless, it is true to say that the majority of Jewish journalists were Liberals, Democrats and Socialists. This is partly due to the fact that the German Conservative Parties became anti-Semitic in practice long before they adopted anti-Semitism as part of their programme, and, above all, because Liberalism signified the fight against constraint in every field, the breaking with tradition, and that consequently it corresponded absolutely to the state of mind of the German Jews, just liberated from the rigid restrictions of their own religion and their former conceptions of life. Having left the most conservative of communities, the one most bound by rigid rules throughout the centuries, they tended to go to the opposite extreme, that of unbridled liberty, becoming thus definitely uniform in their struggle against uniformity.

Freedom from all restrictions, freedom from the bonds of religion, liberty for the individual to direct his own fate, liberty which dissolved into anarchy the communal life of the Jewish community, that was the atmosphere vital for the German Jews of the nineteenth century. The need for liberty was so great, the struggle against all forms of restriction so violent, that this desire for liberty finally destroyed itself and its own successes.

Marx, leading the life of a revolutionary, and Lassalle, that of an adventurer, preached the gospel of an organisation which ultimately would render impossible the life of individuals of their type, and did in fact make it impossible. In the same way, Jewish bankers having entered the economic field as individual pioneers, followed

a path which led to the formation of banking and industrial organisations which, once well established and consolidated could do without original individuals, with the result that the Jews were eliminated from their own companies, from the Reichsbank created by Ludwig Bamberger, from the German Dye Industry, from countless other industries and finally from what was specifically their own field, the Berlin banks. Organisations due to individual initiative could do without individuals once they had become permanent institutions. Within a century it was discovered that freedom from all restrictions opened the way to every form of tyranny. Liberalism, which gave the industrialists the right of uniting in cartels and the workers that of combining in Trade Unions, brought both the individual worker and the individual employer to a state of dependence which was the very reverse of unrestricted liberty. That is why the Jews, who typified this liberty, became a danger for the German nation which had turned conservative. The end of liberty in Germany coincides with that of the German Jews.

It must be noted that this evolution was not the fate of all Jews, but solely of the enlightened Jews, that all writers, artists, scholars, industrialists and the majority of financiers and journalists did not belong to the orthodox Jewish faith, but were all indifferent to religion, whether they had officially left the community or remained within it in name, disdaining the hypocrisy of adopting another religion in which they could as little believe—an attitude which in no way follows from their choice of a profession.

The Germans had not only great religious poets such as Görres, Brentano or Novalis, religious painters such as the whole school of Cornelius or musicians such as Wagner in his last period, but also great industrialists like Krupp and Borsig, and outstanding scientists who were earnest Christian believers, such as Father Gregor Mendel, famous for his theory of heredity and August Weismann, the great opponent of the inheritance of acquired characters, who show that faith and science are by no means incompatible. The same cannot be said for the German Jews of the nineteenth century: in their case the loss of their traditional faith

seems an essential inner condition of their enthusiasm for the sciences and for the arts, for economy and politics. Indeed their success, due to a fanatical zeal, may be explained in the first place by the fact that for each individual the work to which he devoted himself became his god: for the scientists science, for the artists their art, for the industrialists the organisation of their enterprises, for financiers money, for journalists the press. The old uniform faith was replaced by a hundred beliefs, differing from it in every respect, but resembling it in the intensity of self-sacrificing devotion they inspired. It is clear that from the point of view of the community this extreme individualism amounts to a spiritual anarchy which would benefit or injure the country in which they lived according to the line of development of that country itself.

In the measure that the German Jews remained faithful to their religion they were not menaced by spiritual disintegration but they played no important part in any field, cultural or economic, in the nineteenth century. In many cases they deliberately refused to do so. In 1843 one of their leaders, Salomon Titkin, declared in a publication which caused a stir at the time that whoever attended a university could not become a Rabbi because orthodox doctrine was incompatible with free investigation. The orthodox Jews, reinforced by the first generation of Polish Jews who had arrived in Germany, continued as formerly to be the object of a semi-benevolent, semi-hostile disdain on the part of the Germans, but they had not to endure hatred which is only possible between equals, just as, on the other hand, they laid no claim to leading posts and did not occupy such posts. Within the foreign nation they remained a religious and cultural unity which traded with its hosts, but was neither spiritually nor physically united with it.

It was not their passive destiny, in no way remarkable and little remarked, which first attracted the attention of the various nations to them. Even to-day in contemporary Germany, the small Jewish business man still ekes out an existence as in the Middle Ages. What called attention to them was the destiny of the others, of the Jews emancipated from their religious and social traditions, of the freest and most detached minds—a phenomenon without precedent

and unique of its kind. Here we are confronted with a human drama of universal significance—the fate of an anarchic community, if the term may be allowed, whose members are united only by the psychological bond of fanaticism and the spirit of self-sacrifice with which each strove and strives unto death to realise a particular good or bad aim which he himself has freely chosen and which for that very reason is of interest to mankind as a whole. Zionism may be the last and necessary attempt to save the Jews physically by the establishment of a nation similar to many others of greater or lesser value. But the fate of the German Jews liberated from their orthodoxy is a matter of supernational significance. This constitutes for the twentieth century an experiment of universal significance, a symbolic myth of the grandeur and weakness of unbridled individualism, heroic and insane like the flight of Icarus and as enthralling as an adventure.

This anarchy and over-productive energy of the German-Jewish community, so eager to be assimilated by the Germans, would never have aroused the hatred of the latter to such an extent—a pathological hatred in view of their small numbers compared with the Germans—if, despite the revolutionary transformation of their character the Jews had not preserved one of their earlier traits: the feeling of their abilities combined with the ambition and often, the power of realising them. Because of this frame of mind and of the activities which it inspired, the Germans without considering their indispensable usefulness to the nation, made of them the supreme adversary, social, moral and racial, and anti-Semitism the sole content of their domestic policy.

Although the examples already quoted in the first chapter prove that the Jews did actually desire those commanding positions in the nations which had received them which were despised by the nationals, this contention nevertheless requires further corroboration as it is opposed by the traditional opinions of neutral observers, National-Socialists and even of Jews.

Max Weber speaks of the Jews as of a race of pariahs. Hitler and Rosenberg contrast Aryan pride with Jewish servility and recently the German-Jewish emigrant, Alfred Döblin, wrote in his book,

entitled *The Jewish Renaissance*: "The fact that on the whole the Jews appear amongst the nations as a slave people is something unique and anything but praiseworthy." But he himself mentions that in earlier times the Jews had been so completely masters over the Cossacks that they, as factors of the Poles, kept the keys for the Greek Churches, and that the Cossacks could not be baptised, buried or married without paying them a tax. The Cossack Wars were therefore not wars in which the Jews as slaves revolted against the Cossacks as their masters, but were fought by the Cossacks, as Döblin himself states, under the slogan: "The Poles have delivered us as slaves to the accursed brood of the Jews."

According to the historian Dopsch, from the beginning of the Middle Ages this so-called slave race played a large part in the slave trade indispensable to the economy of the period, not as commodities of the trade, but as persons appointed by the government to purchase the slaves. Even these few facts make it appear likely that the authors who attribute to the Jews a slave character see in the expression "a race of masters" the greatest praise and in the term a "slave race" the greatest blame. Such judgments have always hindered the objective study of psychological phenomena. In view of the fact that a race would lose its political power if it possessed too many individuals lacking the slave virtues of humility, discipline and obedience—the *liberum Veto* of ancient Poland is sufficient proof of this—and that conversely the peoples with the typical slave mentality, who uncritically accept their leaders for better or worse, like the Russians or the Chinese, were capable of building empires, it would perhaps be more just to use the term "race of masters" in a derogatory sense and "race of slaves" in a laudatory one. A people composed only of independent individuals, liberty-loving and ambitious, runs the risk of becoming in a very short time a chaotic mass. As a result of this mentality, characteristic of the Jewish community, the 400,000 Jews in Palestine are divided according to Ben Gavriel, into twenty parties and the Zionist movement is already represented by two official congresses in conflict with each other, one of the leaders of the movement Jabotinsky having declared himself independent

for tactical reasons at a moment when a rigid discipline was absolutely necessary.

A German witness, the brilliant satirical Austrian author, Nestroy, has depicted in his travesty of Judith and Holophernes this Jewish characteristic that each desires to be his own master, in a conversation between soldiers in a town besieged by an enemy general. On the order of a corporal: "One, two, one, two, halt!", one of the soldiers replies: "I am getting tired of being ordered around," a second says: "Is he any better than we are?", the third: "Isn't one Jew as good as another?", and when their superior gives the order "Eyes left" and refuses to tell them why they must do so, they resign from the army. Finally they are only saved by a miracle, as actually the ever-divided Jewish community seems only to have been saved by a miracle. Nothing is therefore in more complete contradiction with the inner truth than the contents of the protocol of the Wise Men of Zion. Never has a race been less capable of conceiving and organising a plan for the domination of the world than the Jews who were not even able to colonise Palestine according to a uniform plan and in whom with but little exaggeration each individual forms his own stiff-necked party. Not a community like the Jewish, striving always for an ideal of absolute individual liberty, nor a country like modern Germany, dreaming of an absolute discipline and of a faith in infallible leaders appointed by God, but only a nation combining in just proportion the sense of order and the desire for liberty, can unite political power with cultural fertility. If one abandons all judgments of value which have become so fashionable since Nietzsche and if one ceases to see in the term "master mentality" the highest praise and in that of "slave mentality" bitter reproach, it is easy to prove that ambition was a characteristic trait of the German Jews which often made them strong as individuals but impotent as a community.

Socially the decisive thing for this type of mentality is not so much the striving after wealth as the pleasure in being independent, the desire to feel oneself master of one's decisions and the ability to satisfy this desire by taking certain risks, the wish to be master of one's fate, the undying hope of rising by one's own efforts, the

courage to give up a sure but modest income for the sake of a larger but uncertain one. For townspeople these aims can only be realised as a rule in the class of independent people, more rarely amongst employees, and still more rarely amongst workers (and there in the private workshops rather than in the factories where the work of the individual disappears in that of the mass). The occupational statistics of the Jews show how strong their liking was for this type of life involving greater risks for them but profitable for the nation which received them because it was always a question of indispensable occupations disdained by the nationals.

The Jewish industrial population in Berlin in 1895 included 43% of independent masters, 18% of employees and 39% of workers, whereas the percentages for the non-Jewish population were for independent workers the half (21%), for employees a quarter (4%), and for workers on the contrary the double (75%). In commerce there were amongst the Jews 47% independent, 18% employees and 34% workers as against 24%, 7% and 69% amongst the non-Jews. Thirty years later, in the post-War period, the proportion has not noticeably changed. The figures for the whole of Germany were: in industry 44% of Jews were independent as against 17% of non-Jews; amongst the employees 22% as against 6%, amongst the workers, on the other hand, 33% as against 76%. In commerce, 60% of Jews were independent, 17% employees and 24% workers as against 30%, 16% and 50% of non-Jews. In the public services and the liberal professions, classified under the same heading in the statistics, 86% of Jews were independent as against only 51% of non-Jews, though here allowance must be made for the German liking for official posts which resulted in the proportion of Jews in these callings being smaller.

Still more striking is this desire for independence in those spheres where it could not be fully satisfied and therefore sought a partial realisation. If German Jews as workers were not independent, they nevertheless preferred to work in workshops where they had a greater chance of individual activity and greater possibilities of social advancement than the uniform mass of factory workers. Four-fifths of all Jewish workers and only one-fifth of non-Jewish

workers were in workshops; a fifth of the Jewish workers and four-fifths of the non-Jewish workers were in factories. That is why there were five times as many Jewish workers as their percentage relative to the non-Jews would have led one to expect in the clothing industry, which offers a certain scope for the initiative of the worker, whereas in the building industry it was just the reverse, Jews being two or three times fewer. Finally among agricultural workers the most oppressed and the most dependent on their employers, there were no Jews whatever.

These facts can only be explained by their desire for independence and not for any particular aptitude for the lucrative professions. For the material situation of the agricultural workers, however bad it might be, was at least as good as that of a large number of independent Jews in the big towns, namely, of the pedlars, who were nearly all Jews, or the little tailors or cobblers who, all equally poor, lived together in the same lodging houses and with a greater anxiety as to the morrow than the farm labourers. But whereas the farm labourer represents the lowest grade servant, the pedlars, hawkers and, above all, the countless commission agents, almost dying of starvation, amongst whom the Jews were numerous because of the antipathy of the Germans for these necessary occupations, represent the lowest class of masters, a shabby and pitiable class which, nevertheless, has in common with the other independent classes the necessity of free decision in their trifling affairs and the possibility of social advancement. "A Jew," said one of my German friends, exaggerating slightly, and without meaning it as praise, "would rather die of hunger or commit suicide than remain a servant."

Actually remarkably few Jews were to be found amongst domestic servants in Germany. Whereas the keeping of Christian servants in Jewish households has repeatedly been forbidden since the Middle Ages there has never been any demand for a protection of Christian servants against Jewish competition. In Germany the recent anti-Jewish laws forbidding Jews to employ Christian servants—a prohibition which has become traditional for anti-Semitism—threw 30,000 Christian servants out of work in Berlin alone. A strange

race of slaves whom so many Germans, members of the master race, do not disdain to serve.

The lowest class of Jews, the beggars, who probably figure in statistics as so-called peddlars or commission agents and thus swell the number of independent individuals, presents the same character. The story is told that a Jewish beggar answered a companion who warned him against trying to solicit from Baron Rothschild because the latter was in a bad temper: "Why should I let him off anything? Who lets me off?" For he takes charity on a footing of equality as a right. He does not ask a favour. The Christian beggar is humble on principle, the Jewish beggar is insistent. The almsgiver may consider the first attitude a virtue, the second a vice, but leaving apart all judgments of value, humility is a characteristic for the mentality of a slave as its opposite may reflect a profound belief in human equality.

This love of independence drove German Jews more and more into the towns. Whatever value one places on the big town as a factor in the economic and cultural life and future of a nation, it is certain that for the individual it offers the possibility of a life much less under observation and hence more free than that in a small town or in the country. The small business man, the employee and even the worker in small towns, the domestic population in the country are more or less completely dependent on the opinion of their employers, on their clients and on the officials, and generally more completely exposed to the criticism of their environment. In the big towns, where for this reason National-Socialist writers enamoured of "blood and soil" only see depravity, the individual at the end of his day's work begins to be his own master and even poverty, which in the country is a disgrace, is without shame. There the lowest have a chance, if not statistically at least psychologically, of rising, because in contrast to the stability of rural conditions the rapid changes in the towns seem to make possible sudden rises and equally sudden falls. And if all of them have not their share of bread, most of them nevertheless have their share in the games organised to-day, as in the time of the Romans, to pacify the eternal discontent of the population of the big

towns: parades, public concerts, sports, shop windows, theatres and cinemas, whose prices have now been brought almost within reach of all.

The life of the big towns is more uncertain and more dangerous but more independent than elsewhere. Although the possession of landed property, forbidden to the Jews until late in the nineteenth century, was finally permitted to them, and one might have expected then to see them leave the big towns to establish themselves in small ones or in the country, it is exactly the contrary which took place, as the life of the big towns accorded better with their mentality. In rural Germany, in East and West Prussia, in Pomerania and in Posen, in Silesia and in Schleswig, the number of Jews fell, according to Teilhaber, by 60,000 between 1890 and 1910—a third of the total population—whereas during the same period it increased in Berlin and Brandenburg by 85,000, so that in 1910 Berlin had as many Jews as all other provinces put together including Saxony and Hanover. In 1895 according to this author, the number of Jews in big towns and in towns with less than 20,000 inhabitants was the same, whereas in 1920 there were four times as many in the big towns. According to the *Handbook of Political Science* and the *Jewish Lexicon*, in 1925 a quarter of the total German population lived in towns of more than 100,000 inhabitants, but no less than two-thirds of all German Jews, that is, 376,000 out of 564,000, lived there. And this development has further increased since anti-Semitism flared up anew, strangely enough not in the areas where the Jews were numerous but in those where they were relatively scarce. Anti-Semitism was always more aggressive in the country than in the big towns. It is interesting to note that in Bavaria, where the new wave of anti-Semitism started with the National-Socialist movement, the Jews have been diminishing since 1840; in 1925 their numbers had fallen from 60,000 to 50,000, that is, by a fifth, thus reducing their proportion of the total population from 1.4% to 0.7%. Whether the movement of the Jews towards the big towns was determined by the more violent anti-Semitism of the country districts or by the character of the Jews themselves, the fact remains that they consisted for the most part of townspeople amongst whom

the feeling of equality and the hope of social advancement were much stronger than in the rest of the population.

The same reason accounts for the desire for wealth amongst the Jews which, like every strong desire, develops the capacities of realising it. Any other community forced to live like the Jews under hard and special laws, excluded from all professions enjoying the esteem of nations in which they lived, perpetually menaced by expulsion and the loss of even the most primitive means of existence, would have completely disappeared or, as pariahs, they would have accepted the slave occupations in order to have eked out a bare existence. After their expulsion from Spain the Moors, a highly cultivated people, disappeared from history, but the Spanish Jews did not. After the conquest of East Prussia by the Templars the vanquished Slavs for centuries fell to the level of serfs and agricultural labourers. The Jews were taken as prisoners to Babylon; a few generations later the greater part refused to return to Palestine because, thanks to the wealth acquired in the interval, they had been able to enter the ruling classes of their conquerors. The desire for wealth and the power of acquiring it were actually throughout the centuries the only means for the Jews of avoiding slavery.

In the Middle Ages when they were prevented by law from becoming knights, members of guilds or free peasants, they were as a class the property of the Emperor, but never slaves as individuals. They were never serfs bound to the land. Everywhere since the end of the Middle Ages their social advancement and, later, their legal equality was achieved by individuals amongst them obtaining certain privileges by means of their wealth and becoming the pioneers of a movement for the extension of the same privileges to a greater number. Thus in 1670 the Jews were expelled from Vienna; but when shortly afterwards the Court factors, Samuel Oppenheimer and Samson Wertheimer became indispensable to the Austrian rulers on account of their talents as financiers, both of them, as Dubnow relates, made a point of procuring the right of settlement in Vienna for other Jews by engaging them in their firms, so that fifty years later the number of Jews living in Vienna

was again 400 as in 1670. In 1763 the permit to extend to the second child of the family the right of residence and marriage granted by the king, cost the Jewish community 70,000 talers. Later the tax for founding a home was from 100 to 150 talers and the parents of the newly-married couple had to undertake to export products of the royal porcelain manufactories to the amount of 15,000 talers. There is nothing remarkable therefore in the fact that they cultivated their powers of acquiring wealth, which was the condition of their social existence, "when the Jewish plutocracy under Frederick II alone enjoyed royal protection and gained in social standing during the Seven Years War". What is astonishing is that the desire to enjoy social standing remained unimpaired despite all difficulties. The traditional view that wealth was the necessary prerequisite for social existence could not be changed throughout the nineteenth century in Germany even after the emancipation when they enjoyed equal rights. For some of the professions, and in particular those which gave social standing apart from wealth, namely the civil servant, the judge and the officer, remained closed to the Jews: whereas the occupations open to them, above all that of merchant and in the east of Germany that of industrialist, frequently led during this period of expanding capitalism to great wealth in the event of success. Consequently, at the beginning of the twentieth century, they paid in all German towns several times the amount in taxation which would normally have corresponded with their numbers.

According to Sombart, in 1907 they paid in Berlin, where they constituted 5% of the population, 30% of the total taxes. In Aachen they were about 1% and paid 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ %; in Posen about 4% and paid 24%; in Breslau about 4% and paid 24%; in Frankfurt about 7% and paid 21%; in Essen, the region of the Christian industrialist Krupp, where they were 1%, they paid 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of the taxes. These figures, however, do not prove that the Jews were on the average richer than the ruling classes in Germany because they had few representatives amongst the great landowners, who, in spite of their great wealth and aristocratic life, paid actually very little in taxes, while the princes who were richer still paid none at all.

It was within the bourgeoisie, which for a few decades could also be reckoned to the ruling classes in Germany, that the Jews attempted to make up by greater wealth for the influence of which they were deprived by being excluded from posts of authority.

It is true that this wealth was of a different nature and served other ends than that of the well-to-do classes in Germany. Invested less in real estate than in shares and cash, it was almost entirely liquid. It was the wealth of masters, who to-day as in the Middle Ages, were always in danger of being deprived of it in consequence of their being a minority in the midst of a hostile environment. The wealth was just as much menaced as its owners. It was liquid also in the sense that, in contrast to the wealth of the Shylock, it was in constant movement. The principle of the majority of rich Jews was to live and let live. The German theatres and concert halls, the fashionable spas were supported by them far beyond their share in the population so that many of the old centres of culture such as the German theatre in Prague were preserved almost exclusively by their assistance, while others such as the Salzburg Festival, were inaugurated on their initiative.

When the Jews were expelled as readers and authors after the revolution, the turnover of the German printers and publishers fell from 1,320 to 860 million marks, that of the book printers alone from 800 to 500 million marks. By suppressing this important class of solvent buyers and of competent dealers German art-dealing has ceased to be of any importance, either at home or abroad. The old Jewish tradition, which considered wealth as a sign of Divine approval involving the obligation of performing good works, was blended with the desire to penetrate into the ruling classes of the nation by means of outstanding actions, so that in Germany and in Austria the great donations to scientific and other institutes were largely due to Jewish money, and in a proportion greatly exceeding their share in the national wealth. Just as Rockefeller and Carnegie, with their fundamentally Puritan outlook—which is by no means unlike the Jewish mentality as regards the relations between wealth and charity—devoted much of their wealth to founding institutes, so the Jews in Germany were seldom solicited in vain by the

museums, the scientific institutes and private hospitals. After the assassination of her son the mother of Walter Rathenau made a gift to the nation of his villa, which after the National-Socialist Revolution was transformed into a home for aged Aryan actors. In view of these undeniable facts the hostility to this liquid Jewish wealth, so productive for culture, is less to be explained by the peculiarities of the Jewish character than by a trait of the German character which will be discussed later. It is a striking fact that the typical modern German greatly respected the incomparably greater and much more stable fortunes of his former princes and the nobility, who were never noted for their liberality, and yet regarded Jewish wealth with a persistent hostility, although continually making demands on it.

In France since the Encyclopaedists, in Germany since the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was another means in addition to wealth whereby the members of a minority who neither by birth nor by the threat of force could have the claims due to their achievements recognised, and that was education. The scholar, the man of letters—who formerly was little more than the lackey of princes and lords—claimed, once the bourgeoisie had come to power, to be included amongst the upper classes of the nation, and the Jews from then on, at the cost of innumerable moral and material difficulties, succeeded by study and work in gaining admittance to them.

The proportion of Jewish students at the Prussian Universities was 9% between 1886 and 1891, that is to say, ten times their proportion of the total population. From 1905 to 1906 they constituted 7% of the students, and in 1929, when the propaganda of the Nationalist Professors and students tended to turn them against the University, it was still 4%. The proportion of Jewish girl students, after deducting the foreigners, amounted actually to 13%, fourteen times their share in the population. In Posen, according to Ruppin, in 1906 out of 100 Christian children 8 and out of 100 Jewish children 58 proceeded to secondary schools; in Bavaria the numbers were 5 as against 40, in Baden 7 as against 45, in Berlin 14 as against 67, and in Hamburg 21 as against 96, so that in Berlin

2 out of every 3 Jewish children and in Hamburg almost every Jewish child attended a secondary school. "The number of Jews in the elementary schools in Prussia," says the same author, "was not even half of the proportion of all Jewish pupils compared with the total number of pupils, whereas it was four times as much in the continuation schools, ten times as much in the secondary schools for girls and eight times as much in the secondary schools for boys."

In Austria the position was very similar. In 1932, when the Jews constituted not quite 3% of the total population, the continuation schools, at which attendance was compulsory, but which did not prepare for the university, were only attended by 3,900 Jewish children out of a total of 148,000 ($2\frac{1}{2}\%$). The secondary schools, on the other hand, had 6,200 Jewish children out of a total of 62,000 pupils, that is 10%. The ethnologist Zollschan not only established their numbers but also registered their successes. In statistics dealing with girl pupils in Vienna from 1895 to 1905, he showed that the Jewish pupils were always better than the German, Czech and Hungarian pupils. This is no proof, however, as Zollschan seems to think, of greater intelligence, but as most observers would agree, of greater ambition.

This thirst for education is not due to the desire to make money. Otherwise, why should successful Jews already in the second generation, have refused to follow their fathers in lucrative commercial undertakings in order to take up an artistic or scientific career bringing them in much less, or—renouncing their religion—to become officials? Further, Jewish students continued to pour into the Universities even after a University career had become less attractive and the prospects of Jews, in consequence of the growth of anti-Semitism, had greatly deteriorated. This love of knowledge was based much more on Jewish tradition, which for centuries had made illiteracy amongst the males an exception and placed "the Amharez", the illiterate, at the bottom of the social scale, far below the beggars; on the ineradicable belief that knowledge is power.

In this respect the character of the Jews in Germany has not

changed. According to Ruppin, there was in Poland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a kind of market for son-in-laws where young Talmud scholars were sought as husbands for rich girls and paid for in their weight in gold. Even in the poorest classes of Eastern Europe the importance of learning and knowledge was so universally accepted that parents spent up to a sixth of their weekly wage for the instruction of their children and "would rather go hungry than deprive them of it". The German Jews of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who became indifferent in matters of religion preserved their high esteem for intellectual activity. In 1900 I myself knew a widow in Berlin who with only a yearly income of 2,500 marks sent her four children to secondary schools without the help of any scholarships, and three of them to the university, realising instinctively, if not consciously, that this was the only means of raising them above the proletariat.

This profound admiration of the German Jews for German culture, which had taken the place of their religion, actually one of their highest qualities, finally proved their undoing—partly because of the German mentality, partly because of the reactions caused by the German attitude in some of the Jewish intellectuals. The Jews, equal in intelligence to the Germans, found greater difficulty in obtaining posts in the liberal and above all the academic professions. Other nations would have shown appreciation of this Jewish élite, whose work was of benefit to Germany as a whole, all the more so as they often concentrated on the new and not yet recognised sciences because they found greater possibilities or employment there, whereas the gifted German student usually did not need to consider this factor. The Germans, whose mentality during the nineteenth century evolved in the opposite direction to that of the Jews, did not recognise either the privations which the Jewish intellectuals imposed on themselves or their merits, and as the mentality from which they sprang—the veneration for reason and learning—was steadily running more and more counter to their own, their ruling classes were by no means disposed to recognise claims to social position based on intellectual merit.

This love of study, therefore, produced amongst the Jews a particularly numerous intellectual proletariat belonging, as regards income, to the serving classes, but by its pretensions to the ruling classes. This proletariat consisted in part of those venerable scholars who, without a hope of ever obtaining a post, found satisfaction in the idealism of knowledge, as formerly did their ancestors, the starving Talmud scholars, and whose unjust fate—for they were the first to be affected by National-Socialism—symbolises the victory of force over intellect. Another category of these intellectuals, seeing itself deceived, after the collapse of the bourgeois revolution, in its conviction that knowledge is power, gave to the lower classes the spiritual weapons of the ruling class. Only in this way can be explained the otherwise incomprehensible drift of so many of them, whose ancestors for nearly two thousand years had provided a model of a unique conservatism, to the radical parties: not only was their ambition wounded but also their inmost belief in the sovereign rights of intellect. That the German ruling classes, the princes and officers, did not give to intellect the highest place nor even an appropriate place seemed to them, who considered it the supreme good, a betrayal.

If intellect and education gave no claim to collaboration according to the view of these ruling classes, then the classes which were still in bondage, the bourgeois first of all and then the workers must be liberated in order to gain the victory for intellect. "The alliance of science and the workers," said one of their pioneers, Lassalle, in his celebrated defence against the accusation of having incited the workers to hatred and contempt of the bourgeoisie, "the alliance of these two opposite poles who, when they are united, will crush all obstacles to culture, all obstacles to civilisation in their iron arms, that is the aim to which I have decided to devote my life as long as I breathe."

Undoubtedly Jewish intellectuals, including the most talented, were numerous who, like Lassalle, fought for the oppressed classes against the ruling classes in the countries which had received them. But they were always, by reason of their very character, officers of democracy and not soldiers in the Liberal Democratic and Socialist

revolutionary movements in Germany in the nineteenth century. They made themselves leaders to break the power of the leaders. As socialists they fought against the bourgeoisie from which they had come and to which they belonged. Marx and Lassalle, Börne and Heine may be mentioned here.

The 1848 revolution in Prussia begins with the Jewish physician Johann Jacoby of Königsberg, the author of the *Four Questions*, which in 1840 demanded the granting of the Constitution promised before the wars of 1813 and shook the whole of bourgeois Germany. It is with him also that it reaches its culmination in the famous audience in which the Prussian king replied to the Liberal delegation that he wished to hear nothing of their demands, whereupon Jacoby, in the midst of a general silence, cried: "That is just the misfortune of kings, that they do not wish to hear the truth." And he is by no means an isolated case: Jewish circles supplied according to the German historian Oncken innumerable recruits for the revolutions of the Thirties and Forties.

In Austria it was the Jew Fischhof who caused the downfall of Metternich. When after Bismarck's victory a great section of the German bourgeoisie altered its attitude and only a tiny party, under the leadership of the Jews Bamberger in the Progressive Party and Leopold Sonnemann of the People's Party of Southern Germany, remained true to the Liberal ideal, a number of Jewish intellectuals went over to the Socialist camp which alone seemed determined to continue the struggle of intellect against "blood and iron". After the defeat in 1918 and the temporary rule of the German Left which finished as early as 1923, that is to say, long before the victory of National-Socialism, many Jews gave up their position as leaders of the opposition and entered the government of the Reich and of the various states. Amongst these were Paul Hirsch, Hugo Preuss, Bernhard Dernburg, Hilferding, Schiffer, Rathenau, Landsberg, Ludwig Haas, Gradnauer, Kautsky, Eisner and Landauer.

The National-Socialists usually quote their relatively high number as proof of the extent to which the Weimar Republic was permeated by Jewry. But they forget that from 1923 the Jews

occupied government posts only in isolated cases and before that were always in a minority in the earlier governments where they did not pursue a policy different from that of their colleagues, though often, as in the case of Hilferding and Rathenau, a more moderate one.

Here there is no question of deciding as to the value or otherwise of these men for Germany, but of ascertaining whether it was their character which compelled them to accept such leading posts after an unprecedented political and economic collapse, after a World War which their opponents and not they had conducted to the point of utter exhaustion. On another plane it is the same phenomenon as we find amongst Jewish scientists. Instead of appreciating the sacrifice involved in the acceptance of these posts, by no means coveted and highly unpopular at the time, German politicians only redoubled their hostility as if the heir could be held responsible for the mediocrity of the inheritance.

But what courage and, at the same time, what stupidity on the part of the Jewish politicians to accept the legacy of a bankruptcy! Many of their intellectuals such as Rathenau, Theodor Lessing, Eisner, Leviné, Landauer, Haase, Harden, Rosa Luxemburg, paid for this mistake with their lives. What a mistake to have thought that a nation like the German would put the blame not on those under whom they experienced the misery and disgrace of the first years of defeat but on their predecessors, the Kaiser, his Ministers or the defeated Generals! In this sense courage and stupidity were both "master" qualities and qualities of the German Jews—stupidity, as lack not of intelligence but of common sense, which, over-estimating its own strength was wrecked on the hard facts of the reality it had misjudged.

The qualities impelling Jewish politicians to take over such hopeless positions of power were not characteristic of their profession. The Jewish economic leaders, bankers and industrialists assumed or retained the responsibility for an economic situation which had become impossible as a result of German defeat. They even attracted attention by their thirst for titles to such an extent that "Commercial Councillor" had almost become in Germany

and Austria one of the first names of a rich Jew. Moreover, the majority of Germans are still very sincerely convinced that Germany's poverty and suffering were caused not by the financial collapse following the War, nor by the inflation produced by Stinnes, nor by the Lahusens or the Eastern Aid scandal, nor to the senseless striving after economic autarchy, but to the failure of the banks directed by the Jews. They mistake one of the symptoms of the disease for the disease itself.

But if it were true in still greater measure than it actually is that after the War and in a period of political and economic decline the Jews had occupied leading posts which the former leaders of the Germans had abandoned either voluntarily or under compulsion, can one understand what it means psychologically when a minority accepts such positions in such a time? These were no carefree posts of honour, no sinecures, as they may often be in more peaceful or more glorious times, but were constantly threatened from the Left by the rage of a nation aghast at defeat and feeling itself betrayed, and from the Right by the hatred of the German ruling classes which had by no means lost their power. Any member of a feeble minority continually under suspicion who voluntarily accepted such posts must have felt that duty and necessity, character and fate, laid upon him the obligation rather to choose destruction than to disappear ingloriously into the mass.

It seems to me probable that in this attitude, despite all the other changes in their mentality, one of the oldest traits of the Jewish community has been preserved. For the dispersion of the Jews throughout the world, which had taken place long before the destruction of Jerusalem, is psychologically comprehensible only on the assumption that already many Jews at the risk of destruction and loneliness strove for ruling posts indispensable to other nations but despised by them.

The Nordic creed, as many of its statements prove, seems to consider it an honour for the Germans to be of the same blood as the Vikings, which in view of the civilising power of the latter on the one hand, and their violence on the other, is a matter of

taste. But there exists another community which offers striking resemblances with the Viking, whose members instead of bondage to the soil prefer to be pioneers in a foreign land, to wander always towards an uncertain fate and to prefer death to slavery; who within other nations are friends and competitors, aliens who at the same time foster its culture. In the world to-day which has become a rigid system of organised nations, the last of the Vikings according to their character and manner of life are not the Germans: they are the Jews.

If the least doubt were still possible as to this characteristic of the Jews, the present attitude of the Germans and the violence of their measures against the Jews would dissipate it. A slave community obeys, submits in silence to the domination of another as something natural. A nation of 80,000,000 inhabitants would have no need to inaugurate what Hitler calls an age-long movement against about half a million Jews and a million and a half semi-Jews. If the Jews are really fleas, as Goebbels maintains in one of his speeches, what a triumph for the German giant to have defeated such a miserable adversary, whose defeat in addition is to inaugurate the millennium. To convoke a Diet at Nuremberg, to proclaim special laws against the Jews is to assemble an army of armour-clad knights to celebrate the defeat of a bug.

To justify this conflict in the eyes of the world the Germans should have emphasised the superiority of the Jews and not their slave nature. Knut Hamsun expressed it very well in one of his letters, in which the essential passage was suppressed by the National-Socialist censorship: "As a Jew you belong to a race," he wrote, "which in consequence of its natural characteristics displays a superiority in all fields of civilisation and in all countries. In the sciences, in art, in literature, in commerce and industry the Jews are in the first rank. This fact is not to my knowledge denied by anyone." He concludes that it is just because of this superiority and not because of their slave nature, not on account of a taint in their blood (as a believer in the racial theory might put it) but on account of its nobility, that a nation which had extended hospitality to the Jews might be led to defend itself against them. Bismarck ex-

pressed the same view when he recommended to the Junkers, the ruling class in Germany to which he himself belonged, the union of the noble stallion with the Jewish mare. A spiritual forefather of National-Socialism, Friedrich Nietzsche, with his usual exuberance and his somewhat extravagant form, goes further than all the facts cited would justify. I quote a passage from his work as an illustration of the conclusions at which a daring but acute observer arrived fifty years ago without the help of social statistics.

"Among the dramas which the coming century invites us to contemplate will be that of the fate of the European Jews. It is now perfectly obvious that for them the die is cast, that they have crossed their Rubicon. Nothing remains for them but to become the masters of Europe or to lose Europe as long ago they lost Egypt when they found themselves placed before a similar Either-Or. But in Europe they have been through a hard school for eighteen hundred years, such as no other nation can look back on, and in such a manner that it is not the community but above all the individual who has profited by the experiences of this terrible period of training.

"The result is that the spiritual and intellectual resources of the modern Jews are extraordinary. Amongst all the inhabitants of Europe they are the ones who, to escape a serious difficulty, most seldom have recourse to drink or to suicide, which lies so close to the hand of those less talented. Every Jew has in the history of his fathers and forefathers a mine of examples of the coolest self-possession and constancy in appalling situations, of the most subtle avoidance and exploitation of misfortune and change. Their bravery under the cloak of cringing servility, their heroism in the *spernere se spemi* exceeds the virtues of all the saints. Attempts have been made to make them contemptible by treating them contemptuously during two thousand years and blocking their path to all honours, to everything which is honourable, pushing them all the more deeply into the unsavoury occupations—and truly this treatment has certainly not rendered them less dirty.

"But contemptible? They themselves have never ceased to feel themselves called to the highest things and the virtues of all sufferers

have likewise never ceased to adorn them. The way in which they honour their fathers and their children, the sound sense of their marriages and their marriage customs distinguishes them amongst all Europeans. In addition they understood how to draw a feeling of power and of eternal vengeance out of those occupations which were left to them (or to which they were left); it must be said in excuse even of their usury that without this occasional, pleasant and useful torturing of those who despised them they could scarcely have succeeded in respecting themselves so long. For our respect for ourselves depends on our power of being able to repay both good and evil.

"Nevertheless the Jews never let themselves be carried too far by their desire for revenge: for they all have the liberty of mind and also of soul which are produced by frequent changes of place, of climate, of the customs of neighbours and oppressors. They possess by far the greatest experience in all that concerns relations with other men and even in passion they exercise the caution born of experience. They are so sure of their intellectual suppleness and their acumen that they never find it necessary, even in the most bitter of situations, to earn their bread by mere physical strength as labourers, porters, agricultural slaves. Their manners reveal that they were never given refined emotions for the soul and beautiful weapons for the body: an element of insistence alternates with their frequently tender but almost always extreme servility. But now that from year to year they intermarry with the best of the European nobility they will soon have acquired a rich inheritance of good manners both mental and physical so that in a hundred years they will be sufficiently noble in appearance not as masters to arouse shame in those whom they control. And that is the important thing!

"That is why a decision in their case is still premature. They themselves best know that there is no possibility for them at present of conquering Europe or of any act of violence: but that Europe some time or other will fall into their hand like a ripe fruit if they only stretch it out. Meanwhile they need to distinguish themselves in every field of European education and to be amongst the first, until they at last have the power of determining

what shall give distinction. Then they will be called the inventors and pioneers of the Europeans, and will no longer offend the shame of the latter. And whither shall this abundance of great impressions which Jewish history leaves to every Jewish family, this abundance of passions, virtues, decisions, renunciations, conflicts and victories of all kinds, whither shall it flow if not finally into great spiritual individuals and works. Then when the Jews can point to such jewels and golden vessels as their work which the briefer and less profound experience of the European nations cannot and could not bring forth, when Israel will have transformed its eternal vengeance into an eternal benediction of Europe, then will that seventh day have once more arrived on which the old God of the Jews could rejoice in Himself, His creation and His chosen people. And we shall all, all rejoice with Him!"

Whether this hymn, which depicts exactly the cultural service rendered by the Jews to their hosts but ignores their weakness as a community, be justified or not is beside the point. What must be denied is that the German-Jewish community was a community of slaves and equally it must be admitted that they competed with the Germans in many of the master occupations. But not always, not everywhere and not for everyone is the competitor an enemy who must be humbled, exterminated or expelled from the country. He can serve the development of one's own power if he be accorded a place from which he can increase the power of the State by his talents, as the English and the Dutch seem actually to have succeeded in doing. A short time ago the representative of the Italian government declared at a congress that the Jews in Italy, to whom high and the highest offices had been entrusted as a matter of tradition, had always filled these posts most satisfactorily. That the Germans, in contrast to so many other nations, chose the path of hate and not that of reason is due to their own historical past and to the development of their mentality since the middle of the eighteenth century, which has steadily increased the opposition between both communities instead of diminishing it. Hence the cause of the present situation lies not only in the revolutionary transformation of the mentality of the German Jew,

not in their superabundance of gifted individuals nor in their old trait of ambition, but to a much greater extent to the change in the mentality of the German people during the nineteenth century. An outline of this evolution will be attempted in the following chapter.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The German Mentality

The German mentality as at present embodied in National-Socialism—though not only in it or since its advent—is fundamentally different from the mentality of the German-Jewish community. The renunciation of their own tradition, their unco-ordinated dispersal over the country and the extraordinary productivity of the Jews are at the opposite extreme to the fanatical traditionalism, the rigid uniformity and the intellectual subordination of the political and spiritual leaders of the Third Reich and of the masses who follow them. The desire to revive ancient or even relatively recent traditions is shown by their exaggerated and sentimental preference for Germanic gods and heroes, by the glorification of Widukind, of the Vikings, of Ekkehart, of Frederick the Great, by the love of the eternal German soil and the blood of their ancestors. Their passion for uniformity appears in the construction and synchronisation of every field of activity, in economics, politics, the arts and sciences, and in the monomania which consists in considering and explaining the multiplicity of phenomena only from the racial angle. The deliberate intellectual sterility manifests itself in the horror of every new and personal idea, in the blind obedience and the discipline which the leaders demand of the German intellectuals and to which the latter seem to be able to submit with a good grace.

As is true of most communities, there is no question here of eternal or unalterable qualities. The ruling classes from whose intellectual attitude alone the character of a nation at any given period is derived, had in Germany during the second half of the eighteenth century not the slightest desire to re-establish the bonds

with the past. Actually such bonds did not exist. The German princes and the nobility were not influenced by the mentality of the Cherusicans or the Hohenstaufen, or by the later ideas of the Reformation. Their chief ambition was rather to turn away from German culture and even from the German language and to replace it by a servile imitation of the French kings and of the "esprit" of French writers and philosophers. It is not possible to consider this cult of a foreign ideal and total disregard of national tradition merely as a characteristic of an anti-national ruling class doomed to extinction. It must rather be regarded as one of the qualities of the German nation at that time. For it is precisely those very Germans whom National-Socialism presents as models who shared this standpoint. In his letters on German literature, written in French like the rest of his works, Frederick II, the Unique as Alfred Rosenberg calls him, advised the Germans how to acquire an intellectual culture worthy of the name. He cites instructive examples from the Greeks and the Romans, refers to French, English and Italian literature, but ignores the older German literature so completely that he does not even mention Luther's name. He only praises the Peace of Westphalia, which for a modern German would be another "shameful peace" like that of Versailles, as one of the pillars of German liberty. It was just at this time that the last political bond with the great German tradition of the Holy Roman Empire was broken. Before the Seven Years War the German Empire was certainly feeble, but it was not yet an empty term. It was the Seven Years War which made a mockery of the German Imperial Army and relegated the German Emperor to the limbo of forgotten things, with the nation applauding as it had never done even for the defence of Alsatia by Prince Eugene.

For the rising bourgeoisie was no less devoid of traditional sense than the German princes or the German nobility. The new German national literature did not draw inspiration from the forgotten sagas, nor from Luther, Hans Sachs, Grimmelshausen or Günther, but from the Messiah of Klopstock, from Shakespeare and from the Celtic bards, and later, during the classical period, from the Greeks and Romans. Goethe's *Goetz von Berlichingen*, the first German

drama to evoke the German past, did not aim at glorifying it in any way and was merely an incident for the generation in which it appeared. Goethe as an old man detested the *Nibelungenlied*. Not one of all Schiller's historical dramas deals with a subject from German history and the same is true of Wieland's numerous works. Kant and his followers do not continue the line of the German philosophers Leibniz, Jacob Boehme, Angelus Silesius or Ekkehard, but of the English thinkers, so that even the nationalist Fichte does not mention a single German philosopher of earlier centuries. Down to the Wars of Liberation and the victory of Romanticism, the German bourgeoisie and German intellectuals were profoundly indifferent to the traditions of their own people and at best found them interesting as historical relics.

In the same way Germany at that time was not a unified and uniform country, whether as regards politics, economics or intellectual matters, but offered a spectacle of anarchic confusion. "The particularism of the temporal princes," says Treitschke, "was the most vital political factor in the kingdom." It is true he added that as a result "all the forces of the nation were split up to infinity, broke up into a thousand little streams like the German river: each class, each town, each district a world in itself". One thousand sovereign princes, free towns and independent rulers pursued their private interests. "No count of the Empire who did not build his own Versailles, his own Trianon. In the park of the Palace of Weikersheim the entrance to the residence of the tiny principality of the Hohenlohes was guarded by statues of the world conquerors, Ninus, Cyrus, Alexander the Great and Caesar." Economically the anarchical individualism revealed itself in the fact that in 1790 according to Kulischer, there were in Germany 1,800 customs barriers, and in Prussia at the beginning of the nineteenth century sixty-seven local custom tariffs and an equal number of frontiers. Between Dresden and Magdeburg alone the traveller had to pass sixteen customs boundaries.

Intellectually it was a period, perhaps the only period in Germany, where unrestricted freedom and the development of the individual were the ideal of all thinkers. "Unrestricted liberty

alone" taught the great Thomasius at that time, "is the true life of the spirit." Schiller begins his career as a poet with the motto "*In tyrannos*". It is not common aims which united under the name *Sturm und Drang* the countless writers, each of whom followed his own individual path, but solely the passionate fanaticism with which they strove to realise independent intellectual ideas.

At one and the same time Lavater was a religious mystic, Basedow a religious rationalist, the Stollbergs the forerunners of a nationalist poetry, Lenz and Wagner the founders of a social art. Winkelmann was the discoverer of an idealised antique, Wieland the poet of a Greek rococo, Hamann a prophet of a magical philosophy. In Kant rationalist philosophy reached its culmination. Nikolai was the leader of the Enlightenment, although during the same period Pictism lost none of its power. Goethe, as a young man, voices in his *Werther* a sentimental conception of life, in his *Goetz*, on the other hand, an heroic one. And all the contradictions of this period were not felt as such at the time. All these poets and philosophers, united only by the idea of revolutionary intellectual freedom which dominated their lives, acted each with the same force, not on a different, but on the same great reading public. The veneration of the word, which is in such marked contrast to the present preference of German youth for physical prowess, manifested itself in an indiscriminate enthusiasm for all new publications, no matter how opposed their tendency. Lamprecht quotes a passage from the year 1799: "We read everything we can lay our hands on, Wieland's *Agathon* and Gustav Waldmann, Walter von Momberry and *The Peace*, Brother Martin and Till Eulenspiegel, *The Exaltations* of Heidenreich and the *Liaisons Dangereuses*. The countrywoman behind her cheese basket reads as does the lady in her boudoir, the errand boy plunges into his master's books as soon as the latter turns his back: the maid fetches her books from the lending library, children read, old men read—the whole nation has gone reading mad."

That is why the many-sided and freely-developed personality, the original genius who draws everything from himself and whose vision embraces earth, heaven and hell, appears as the supreme type

of man, in contrast to the present day where the ideal of blind intellectual submission to an instinctive and traditional idea predominates. Just as Goethe and Kant, Herder, Humboldt and Hegel attempted to recreate in their works the entire universe, art, science and life in its totality, so likewise the spiritual ideal of the representative classes of the nation was not simplicity but versatility. Universality and not specialisation was the aim even of their scholars. Not the nation but a free mankind was the dream of all their leading thinkers and their longing was for the fullest development of personality and not the omnipotence of the state. For Humboldt, the action of the state should be limited to the development of the individual. Intellectual liberty should prescribe the limits of State power. "Germans, you hope in vain to become a nation," Goethe exclaims, "but you can become free men." Humboldt was a Prussian privy councillor, Goethe a minister.

It is both astonishing and yet natural that this longing for the freedom of the individual produced, exactly as in the case of the individualistic period of the German Jews, an intellectual activity and productivity unknown in German history either before or after. Rothacker, one of the National-Socialist scholars who with much effort and little success tried to establish in a book the stability and unity of the German national character throughout the centuries, simply omits the period up to 1830 from his description of the German in the nineteenth century, but even he says that "Geniuses then dropped from the skies like a shower of falling stars." During this period from 1760 to 1830 there was in fact an incredible number of prominent thinkers, such as Klopstock, Wieland, Goethe, Schiller, Lessing, Kleist, Jean Paul, Herder, Hamann, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, the two Humboldts and the brothers Grimm, Beethoven, Mozart, Haydn, Schubert, to say nothing of other talents not quite in the same class, each of whom, however, could equal great artists and philosophers of the present day. Freedom from tradition, intellectual liberty and productivity characterised every German at that time and these qualities were regarded as typical both by foreign countries and by the German nation itself.

This liberalism, as is so often forgotten to-day, actually gave rise both to the idea of Germany and that of its unification. Without the critical idealism of the all-destroying Kant, Fichte's addresses to the German nation would never have been delivered, without the revolutionary reforms of Stein and Scharnhorst there would have been no victories won by Blücher, without Schiller there would have been no Koerner. The war of 1813 was fought not only against French domination but likewise for intellectual and political freedom. It was fought against the will of the German rulers, who were either on Napoleon's side, like the king of Saxony or the princes of the Rhineland Federation, or like Friedrich Wilhelm III, who had been forced into the war against his will by the coup of one of his generals. It was fought for a future Germany liberated from all restrictive forces. Hence the idea of Germany meant for the German nation at that time and for the thinkers who represented it, not as at present a mystical aim to be striven after for its own sake, but a means of helping the principle of liberty to victory. For this could only be realised in a unified not in a divided state, which could scarcely be said to exist politically, ruled as it was by thirty absolute monarchs and a nobility devoted to them.

For love of German freedom and German unity, representative Germans such as Hoffman von Fallersleben, Freiligrath, Herwegh, Georg Buechner, Friedrich List—to mention only German Aryans and not Jews like Heine and Boerne—spent a great part of their life in prison or in exile. On the other hand, the German princes and their literary servants equally opposed the efforts for freedom and unity. The dismissal of Stein immediately after his victory, the persecution of the Student Associations, the condemnation of Fritz Reuter and other students to death or to thirty years' imprisonment for having worn the German colours at the University, the general prohibition of all present or future writings of the liberal "Young Germany" movement, prove that Germany and liberty constituted a single idea whose realisation was combated by its adversaries and desired by its supporters as such.

For the national idea is always at first supra-national. It sees

in the nation the embodiment of spiritual revolution and in its unity a necessary preliminary condition of such revolution. For the French revolutionaries the birth and triumph of the new France meant the realisation of the ideas of 1789; for the Bolsheviks the new Russia, the realisation of communism; for Italian nationalists such as Garibaldi, Mazzini and Crispi, the unification of Italy the victory of liberalism over clericalism. In the same way, until the victory of Bismarck, freedom in every sphere of intellectual activity, economics and politics was the fundamental principle of the German national idea.

The transformation of the German national character between 1750 and 1930 followed a line very different from that of the spiritual evolution of the German Jews, took place gradually, and was due not to religious but to political events. From the beginning, influential circles which neither represented the nation at home nor abroad and which, moreover, did not even claim to do so, maintained their own scale of values which was not that of the representative German of the period. "The centre of German politics," says Treitschke, "was not the home of the spiritual activity of the nation." The Prussian Junkers and their instrument the Prussian officers, as created by Friedrich Wilhelm I and his even greater son, possessed, in contrast to the intellectuals by whom Europe and the German nation at that time judged the country, a pride in a glorious past whose value they greatly exaggerated. This past was transformed later into a real tradition, almost a religion, which neither the defeats of Jena or of Auerstaedt nor the intellectual and political insignificance of the Prussian kings of the nineteenth century could shake.

Here intellectual uniformity reigned supreme. Instinctively those who tried to depart from the traditional mentality were eliminated from the army and from the civil service. Here there was no revolutionary individualism and no productive activity. The military and administrative reforms—indispensable during and after the Napoleonic wars—were carried out by personalities to whom a short period of power was unwillingly accorded, but who both by their intellectual qualities and ancestry belonged to the spiritual

Germany only victorious in appearance. Scharnhorst was a Southern German, Stein a Westphalian.

In spite of their political power, the mentality of the Prussian Junkers was far from being representative of the nation. "The citizens of Stettin fought desperately on their ramparts to keep their town under the rule of Swedish liberty and to preserve it from the 'Blood and iron' Prussians." Winkelmann, the greatest scholar of his time, said of Prussia: "I think of this country with horror. Better to be a circumcised Turk than a Prussian." "If the victories of Frederick had somewhat lessened the old hatred against Prussia" writes Treitschke, in his description of the feeling in Germany at that time, "nevertheless every citizen even in the Protestant states thought himself lucky not to be a Prussian," and after 1813 the inhabitants of the Rhineland for decades considered their incorporation into Prussia as a grave injustice.

The Prussian Junkers never felt themselves as Germans, but always as Prussians. They formed an isolated non-national group from whom even the Hohenzollerns, in so far as the latter did not share or adopt their mentality, were intruders. In the course of the nineteenth century, during which the victory of Prussia enabled them gradually to extend their domination over the whole of Germany, the ideas embodied in the poet and thinker, which till then had been representative of the nation, had no influence on them. On the contrary, they imposed their ideas on the country to such an extent that in the period of transition lasting from 1814 to 1864 it is impossible to recognise any uniform national character. From 1814 on there were two Germanys: a well-disciplined conservative Germany full of respect for tradition standing face to face with another Germany, liberal, unfettered by tradition and revolutionary almost to the point of anarchy. Already during the Wars of Liberation the same thing happened that was to be repeated in even greater measure in the wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870: the battles were fought for a triumph of a spiritual Germany under the leadership of a military Germany which neither knew nor recognised the German nation. The enthusiasm of the masses was inspired by the ideas of Germany and liberty while the officers

were fighting for the glory and power of Prussia and the honour of the Prussian dynasty.

Before 1813, except for the Prussian Junkers who never considered themselves as belonging to the German nation and the military and official classes dependent upon them who were also morally isolated, the German people were united and homogeneous. After the victory, military success stimulated a pride which largely contributed to convert a great part of the nation to the traditionalist ideas and to the glorification of force. Revolutionary France was defeated to a certain extent by a liberal Germany almost as revolutionary as itself, dominated however by Prussia. At that time these two Germanys were on the whole distinct and separate, but from then on the chief characteristic of the modern German spirit becomes visible—a characteristic even more significant than its uniformity and glorification of force—namely, its duality, its desire to unite freedom and respect for tradition, democracy and the mediaeval spirit, national autarchy and cosmopolitan culture. At the Wartburg Festival in 1817 the students under the leadership of Jahn, a great admirer of the Teutons, burnt as symbols of the reaction a Uhlan's uniform, a wig and the instructions to the Prussian gendarmerie, but also at the same time the code Napoleon which had brought them civil liberty. The German Romantics prize nothing more highly than moral and intellectual liberty, but condemn nothing so severely as political liberty.

At that time the Catholic student, Karl Sand, under the influence of the Nationalist fever assassinated Kotzebue whom he considered a Russian spy, and revolutionaries like Goerres or Gentz became overnight supporters of the most rigid legitimism. The Customs Union was born of the idea of an economically united Germany, but became a Prussian and not a German instrument of power, and Friedrich List, its spiritual father, committed suicide in exile. Just as the democratic Uhland sang of the Middle Ages in his best poems, so the majority of Germans were at one and the same time liberals and legitimists, revolutionaries and pious believers, radicals and mediaevalists. The democratic Parliament of 1848 offered the Imperial crown to the king of Prussia who despised

all parliaments and for whom, as for all Prussian Junkers, Germany was an empty word. The Hegelian philosophy, which defended as reasonable everything which exists and consequently also development as existing and altering the already-existing, is a symbol of this spiritual transition period. Reactionaries and revolutionaries, supporters of guilds and socialists drew from it their doctrines.

This characteristic, perhaps the most important of the national features typical of the modern German, had its origin in this period, developed throughout the history of the foundation of the German Empire and became for a long time an integral part of the German mentality. The struggle of the German people for a national state only resembled in appearance that of many other nations. The Italians and the Poles, the Czecho-Slovakians and the Hungarians, the Yugo-Slavs, the Greeks and the Finns, they all fought the same battle for the triumph of the national idea and the foundation of a national state; we need not decide whether this was fortunate or disastrous for Europe. But the unification of Germany had one peculiar feature. It was not brought about by the national circles who were its spiritual representatives, but by their non-nationally minded opponents who had always most bitterly opposed it. Prussia remained the fatherland for its king, its Junkers and its officers. Germany, according to Wilhelm I's own words after the foundation of the Empire, was "the lengthened arm of Prussia", a conquered and subjected country. "It was not Prussia which was absorbed in Germany," says Treitschke, who after 1870 was the great historical educator of German youth. "The exact contrary is obviously true: Prussia extended its own institutions to the rest of Germany." In all other countries the idea of unity prevailed over the particular interests of sectional states and groups. Crispien did not wish to make Savoy victorious over the other Italian principalities, but to dissolve it into a unified state. Czecho-Slovakia refused to give special consideration to the Czechish nobility on account of the support which it had given to the efforts for national autonomy, but broke its power, like that of the German nobles, by confiscatory laws. Poland arose again with the help of its patriotic aristocracy, but the latter did not rule

in the new state. Only Germany was united under the leadership of the Prussian king and the Prussian Junkers, who had never and who do not even to the present day feel themselves as representatives of the national idea and as representatives of the German nation, and their power has grown stronger in the new Empire which was created against their wishes by the genius of an individual from their ranks who was almost considered a traitor.

Nothing is more tragic than the figure of Otto von Bismarck. From the earlier representative type of thinker and poet, he took the aim of a unified Germany, but not the idea of a free Germany till then identical with it, while from the dynasty and the Prussian nobility on the other hand, upon whom he imposed against their instinctive feeling the idea of Germany, he accepted the glorification of force, of uniform organisation and of Prussian tradition. He was spiritually isolated from both sides; no popular movement stood behind him, as Treitschke his prophet testified: "We were a tiny group, in Freiburg there were only five of us who at that time supported Bismarck. That is the public opinion which was supposed to have been behind Bismarck. He alone accomplished what was necessary against the will of the people." It was only with great difficulty that he succeeded in converting the dynasty and the non-national nobility from which he was descended, to an acceptance of his achievements: he never was able to convert them to his views. In 1866, as he relates in his *Memoirs*, the advice he tendered his king after the victory was: "Our task must be the establishment of German unity under the leadership of the king of Prussia," and he overcame the violent opposition of the monarch, whose mind was set on territorial expansion, with the help of the liberal Crown Prince and by threatening to resign. Wilhelm I finally agreed in the following words: "As my Prime Minister has abandoned me before the enemy and I am not in a position to replace him . . . I am regretfully compelled to swallow the pill and to accept such a shameful peace." The same thing occurred again in 1870. When Bismarck insisted on making the King of Prussia the German Emperor and not the

Emperor of Germany, which would have been tantamount to proclaiming him its conqueror, Wilhelm I displayed his contemptuous anger in Versailles on the day of the foundation of the Empire. "His Majesty," says Bismarck in his *Memoirs*, "was so angry with me on account of the course of events that, on leaving the platform of the princes, he ignored me, who stood alone in the free space in front of it, and walked past me to shake hands with the generals standing behind me. This attitude persisted several days."

The genius of Bismarck achieved what the typical German of our time persistently strives after, but without the same success—the reconciliation of the irreconcilable. He pursued and realised for the duration of his period in office, two aims which it seemed impossible to realise at the same time: the aim of German unity created by the German liberals and the domination of the Prussian spirit. He knew that the liberals and not the Prussian nobility and the Prussian officer had created the idea of Germany. He cemented the new Empire by means of universal suffrage, making the Reichstag the organ of the new Empire, while leaving in force in Prussia the three-class Prussian franchise. He instituted for the benefit of the working classes a model system of social insurance, but at the same time deprived them by the anti-socialist laws of all right to liberal or revolutionary opinions or activities. The German army, for the first time united and victorious, continued to be led exclusively by the nobility from which alone the active officers were, as formerly, drawn. The administration which exercised a strict but just control over the good citizen, and diplomacy to which the protection of foreign trade was entrusted, remained in the hands of the nobility. Scarcely a scholar, none of the middle class, no intellectuals had any share in the government. For the preceding generation, the creation of a united Germany had been a means of realising the ideals of liberalism. A united Germany had been born, but one in which a meagre modicum of liberty was used as the means of realising the Prussian idea of life. Bismarck's epitaph is a symbol of the valuation of his life's work. It is not dedicated to the liberator nor to the hero who fought for

the unity of Germany against France and Austria, against his king and his own class, who conquered and died, but in complete distortion of the facts it runs: "Here lies a faithful German servant of Wilhelm I." Never in the history of the world was a genius of his calibre robbed of his fame in favour of an honourable mediocrity amidst the applause of the nation whose only merit consisted in allowing him against its will to carry out his work.

His influence on the Prussian Junkers was weak and temporary. He extended their domination over the whole of Germany without their becoming or even wishing to become its genuine representatives. As the conquerors of Germany they stood outside and above the nation and never felt themselves as belonging to the Reich if it acted against Prussian ideas. They constantly opposed Bismarck even after the foundation of the Empire and contributed to his fall. His second successor, Hohenlohe, wrote in his diary: "The Junkers don't care a straw for the Empire." Bülow, who succeeded him, said to them in his farewell address: "The Conservatives have trifled with the welfare of the monarchy and of the Empire," and Bethmann Hollweg reproached them with deliberate damage to the interests of the Empire. They brought about the downfall of the Republican government just as they did that of Bruening and Schleicher when their non-national domination was threatened and they still rule Germany as a Prussian colony through the army and the civil service by deliberately standing aloof from the present German type of National-Socialist.

The victory of Bismarck, on the other hand, completely modified the mentality of the bourgeoisie and of those amongst its intellectuals who symbolised Germany for the foreigner and who contributed to the triumph of National-Socialism.

From then on the bourgeoisie and many of the scientists and technologists recognised the superiority of the mentality so contrary to their own. Organisation, discipline and tradition became now the religion of all classes of the people, amongst whom the poet and thinker was an outsider. The universal hegemony of Germany became their aim, science and technology, intelligence and personality merely instruments for its achievement.

Commerce and industry, which formerly had been the representatives of liberal ideas and for the most part had stood in opposition to the ruling class of Junkers, now attributed their victory over foreign competition not to their own abilities, but to the protection of their military forces and they enthusiastically supported the growing absolute power of the Junkers, transforming their liberalism into national-liberalism. Even the working class, forced into opposition by its natural interests, accepted this mentality. German Social-Democracy was as excellently organised and disciplined and as submissive to authority as its opponents, the only difference being that the hero to whom they paid the same blind allegiance was not Wilhelm II but Karl Marx. The unity of the Party was to them as much an aim in itself as the unity of the State was for their opponents. For the sake of this unity an extreme radical pacifist, Haase, announced in the historical Reichstag sitting of August 4th, 1914, the unanimous support of his Party for a war which he himself at the Party meeting immediately preceding it had described as madness. The trade unions created a bureaucracy which was as disciplined and authoritative as that of the state itself. All parties without exception allowed their members no expression of individual opinion. In France each important problem creates a changing majority. Even in England in spite of party discipline, a Member of Parliament may occasionally disregard the official orders of his party. In Germany each party was rigidly attached to its leaders and its programme.

German scholars withstood longer than any others this conception so remote from their old ideal. In 1870 a large number of that earlier generation which, like the seven professors of Goettingen, had been ready to resign from their posts as a protest against a violation of the Constitution, were still alive. The following generation were still under the influence of a system of education in which the aim of science was not the aggrandisement of the nation, but truth. They only adopted the mentality of the ruling classes in so far as they utilised discipline, order and organisation as a means for the service of science and by so doing brought about a renaissance of the natural sciences

and in particular of medicine, as long as they retained truth as their aim.

Karl Ludwig Schleicher, who discovered the use of local anaesthesia, described in his *Memoirs* the installation of Ernst von Bergmann in the clinic of his predecessor, the surgeon Langenbeck. It is a description without any political tendency, and applies to all the scientific organisations of the time. It gives us an excellent picture of the evolution of the scientific mentality which, while preserving its ideal of intellectual independence, had had recourse not to the fostering of individual powers but to a perfected organisation in order to realise it: "We witnessed a reorganisation which is one of the most interesting chapters in my medical recollections. The old routine was replaced by a system of antiseptic drill worked out in minutest detail and applied with the strictness and pedantry of military instruction. Langenbeck, a genius whose sure aristocratic hand had demonstrated methods of surgery introduced almost exclusively by himself, as a virtuoso displays his astonishing powers unattainable by any others, was a very incarnation of the spirit of surgery. His successor was rather a marvellous organiser of accepted ideas, both past and present, which had been compressed into a system capable of being understood and applied by anyone. Just as Moltke, combining the ideas of Frederick the Great and of Napoleon, imposed on his army methods of gaining victories by means of manœuvres and the much-abused Prussian discipline—to which nevertheless we owe the building up of a nation—Bergmann knew how to systematise and supply a foundation for all the existing knowledge scattered haphazard by genius and to impose it on his pupils by truly dictatorial methods. . . . It is only by such methods that every soldier could feel that he had in his knapsack the field marshal's baton. The men of genius could look after themselves. Here the first rule was to acquire manual dexterity, to spend half-hours in preparation, to develop an ever alert consciousness of immediate danger before one thought of giving battle." It is true another half-century and the growing influence of the ruling classes was necessary to transform the rather natural tendency to let genius fend for itself into

a horror of every individual idea, and to make authority and organisation in science an end instead of a means. At that time no doctor of any standing would for love of his country or for the racial idea have lent his name against his medical conscience to the 85,000 sterilisations a year, with their quite incalculable consequences, as many of the leading medical men in modern Germany have done since 1934.

In other sciences the scholars submitted more quickly and much more completely than in the natural sciences to an aim which till then had been completely foreign to them. After Bismarck's victory, history and the history of literature rivalled each other in proving that the power of the country and not its liberty constituted the essence of German life and was the first condition of a German civilisation. The subjective historical writings of Treitschke replaced the objective writings of Ranke, and the cautious research of the brothers Grimm gave way to the fantastic theories of Lagarde and H. St. Chamberlain. It was during this period that the legends were born which transformed the non-national Frederick II and his Prussian and anti-German successors into model Germans. Already the opinions of writers, not their talent, decided their relative rank and Geibel, Wildenbruch, Dahn and Jordan won the approval of the nation, but not Nietzsche or George. It is true that during the Wilhelmenian epoch there were outstanding German poets such as Dehmel, Liliencron or Hauptmann, but the gulf between the political and the intellectual Germany, which had never been entirely closed, became greater than ever. Under Bismarck and even more under Wilhelm II science and technology were of some importance as servants of German power, but intellect itself was considered of none at all. A politician would have been destroyed by ridicule if, before beginning his career, or in the hope of furthering it, he had written a book. A man of letters would have been laughed to scorn if he had tried to enter politics. In England and France, on the contrary, literary activity, to-day as formerly, has never been a hindrance to a political career and from Disraeli to Churchill and Samuel Hoare, from Thiers to Clemenceau, success in the literary world did not exclude success

in that of politics. National-Socialism with its devilish hatred of intellect and reason is a direct descendant of this Prussian tradition.

When Otto Bangert, a writer particularly recommended by the authorities in modern Germany, writes that "the intellectual ideas which penetrated into Germany poisoned the heart of the Nordic man" and that "in the grey army of the German people, history, will, life, pure blood fought against pure reason" he is only repeating the judgment of his spiritual ancestors, the Prussian officers in their barracks, for whom scholars and artists were "intellectual idiots".

The antithesis of blood and intellect on which National-Socialism is based can never be understood by the Western nations, for whom intellect and blood are not contradictory and whose ideal is blood controlled by intellect. For this antithesis implies the crucial experience Germany went through during the nineteenth century—the desperate fight of intellect against force and its defeat by blood and iron. The spiritual history of Germany begins in the nineteenth century with the admiration of pure reason, the victory of an idealist philosophy. It finishes in the twentieth century by despising it. A man who described one of the leaders in Germany to-day as rational would be considered a critic and not an admirer, while anyone who dared qualify him as an intellectual would probably pay for such an insult with his life. Blood and mysticism, force and passion as ends striven for in themselves, tradition for the sake of tradition, dictatorship for the sake of dictatorship, this and not intellect, reason and freedom, which were the dreams of German intellectuals 130 years ago, dominate modern Germany as embodied in National-Socialism.

Nevertheless the influence of the past, even though ridiculed on account of its idealism, has not completely disappeared. Proof of this is that in spite of their cult of force the Germans, true to the duality of their character, have no desire to renounce their claim to be "the people of thinkers and poets". In this connection the words with which Lamprecht, a representative historian of the Wilhelmenian epoch, concludes his history of Germany, are typical of the mentality of a people endeavouring to reconcile force and

reason, liberty and uniformity, but never calling in question the supremacy of blood and the sword over personality: "In spite of its striving for power and its consciousness of its own power, the nation has remained also that of thinkers and poets. . . . The German Michel still lives as the patron of all the great national impulses in the form which the rich religious imagination of our ancestors gave to the archangel, and he will continue to look down on the earth from on high among the clouds, girt with his sword certainly and ready to strike, but borne aloft on the wings of intellect."

This deeply-rooted feeling of being able to be at one and the same time a nation of disciplined warriors and of free poets and thinkers, this being torn between two opposed ideals and desiring to live the one in the spirit and the other in action, permeates National-Socialist Germany just as much as it did Wilhelmenian Germany. To understand this dualism, to appreciate National Socialism, it must be clearly realised that the spiritual and political history of Germany and its unification during the nineteenth century are not the work of the bourgeoisie and the intellectuals who initiated it, that it was not achieved by intellect and liberty, but by their greatest adversaries, the King of Prussia, the Prussian nobility and the German princes, under the motto "blood and iron", and that, on the other hand, the victory of Prussian ideas has not completely eradicated the tendencies and the terminology of humanism. This humanism fulfils, it is true, a very special function at the present time.

In so far as the typical Germans of our day—that is, not the Prussian Junkers whose character has remained unaltered, but the leaders of National-Socialism and their supporters—feel themselves as victors or as fighting for victory, they justify the ruthless exploitation of their victory or their radical principles in terms of the old Germanic ideology of force and the Prussian ideology of organised discipline. In so far, however, as they are defending themselves against the consequences of a defeat or of a loss suffered without the use of arms, they still use, out of love for the Fatherland, the language of democracy, which they have not yet forgotten, and appeal to the eternal rights of man violated by their adversaries.

The typical German of to-day contains within himself two different Germanys each ready for use as occasion demands. The one, whose dream is liberty, individualism, intellectual independence and humanity, and another dedicated to the glorification of power, authority and discipline. At one moment he is in imagination a hero predestined to rule over the slave herd of the other nations, ruthless as a Viking, justified by the sword and poison-gas for his high mission, and mocking at all national and human rights of his opponents, at home and abroad, as illusions of humanitarian sentimentality. At another he is an oppressed victim demanding his rights as a human being and lamenting the decline of culture threatened by the unjust treatment he is receiving. This reconciliation of irreconcilable contradictions, sincere or otherwise, this passion for humanity or inhumanity in the same person according to the situation, this mixture of a lamb and a lion according to the needs of the case, in addition to its uniformity, traditionalism and spiritual sterility, characterises the modern German mentality.

The National-Socialist Revolution has only made it clearer, although its origin goes back to a much earlier date. Thus after the war nothing could rouse greater indignation in the average German—with the exception perhaps of a few Communists and Left Wing Radicals—than the reproach of having caused the War. As early as 1924 the catalogue issued by the union of German booksellers contained 2,300 entries on the War-guilt question and as late as 1933 a scientific institute of the importance of the Economic Institute of the University of Jena had stamped in large red letters on every letter going abroad, both on the paper and the envelope, the words: "Whoever maintains that Germany was responsible for the War, lies. This lie is the root of our misery." A people for whom peace is a supreme good naturally sees in the reproach of having provoked a war a grave insult, but people whose divinely appointed leader can declare emphatically in his fundamental book: "The war of 1914, God knows, was not imposed on the masses, the whole nation desired it"; a people amongst whom for four years and even to-day whoever dared to consider a peace without victory was regarded as a traitor to the nation; a people

whose political catechism declared that "the German is by his very nature a soldier and that National Socialism was born in the World War"; a people whose most cautious ethnologist, Clauss, sees and glorifies "the powerful urge of German blood in the imposing march of the Germanic troops who attacked and destroyed in a series of wars the kingdoms of the Mediterranean from pure caprice"; whose leaders honoured and still honour war as a bath of steel; such a people might logically regret a lost war, but never be indignant at the reproach of having caused it—if, that is, the love of peace and the ruthless warring of the Vikings were not blended together in an harmonious ideal.

An interesting example of this Viking mentality, which curses war and its means when defeated and glorifies them when victorious, came to my notice in a letter addressed by one of the most prominent German Jurists to a Swiss colleague in 1933. There he attributed, in agreement with the opinion current in his country, the fanaticism of German youth to the "accursed blockade" against Germany during the War. But did not the Germans themselves attempt to establish a blockade by means of submarine warfare and did they not make use of it long after the War in the form of a boycott against the tiny minority of the Jews? This power of considering as infamous the use of certain weapons when employed against Germany and as an inevitable necessity when Germany makes use of them even without being attacked, derives from its characteristic mentality. It is a law of intellectual blindness imposed by the state and prescribed by morality.

A new and significant mentality. Any judgment on it is of no interest, but its consequences are revolutionary, dangerous and threatening. It is only by entering more fully into this mentality that it is possible to understand German policy at home and abroad, a policy which is assured of the obedience of its followers, even when it follows with equal enthusiasm diametrically opposed aims.

It enables Germany to push the policy of Bismarck to its extreme, to exalt at one and the same time violence and humanity, authority and liberty, submissive sterility and productivity. Hitler demands in *Mein Kampf* (the text is for the most part in italics)

an unrestricted offensive war against France for its utter destruction and without any real cause: "As long as the eternal conflict between Germany and France can only be fought out in the form of German defence against French aggression it will never be decided, but Germany will lose from one century to the next one possession after the other. . . . Only when this is completely understood in Germany, so that the will to live of the German nation is no longer left to decay in mere passive resistance, but Germany is stirred to assemble all its energy for a final active settlement with France and to throw itself into a final struggle for the ultimate objectives of the German nation, only then will it be possible to bring to an end the eternal and fruitless conflict between ourselves and France. But on condition that Germany only sees in the destruction of France a means of giving to its people the maximum expansion in another direction of which it is capable. It will only be possible to claim that our foreign policy has been successful if in less than a hundred years two hundred and fifty million Germans are living on this continent."

But while these lines which appear without alteration in all editions down to the present day are the spiritual daily bread of German youth in school and in the labour camps, anyone who maintains that Germany desires war is accused of spreading lies. The same editor publishes at the same time in thousands of copies another doctrine of the Führer with the same pretensions to eternal validity, containing a totally different view as regards France: "We are moved to sorrow," said Hitler in his broadcast speech of the 14th October, 1935, addressed to all the nations of the world, "at the idea that these two great peoples should so often in the course of their history have sacrificed the flower of their youth on the fields of battle. I speak in the name of the entire German people when I say that we are all filled with a sincere desire to obliterate an enmity whose sacrifices bear no relation to any possible advantages. . . . After the return of the Saar to Germany only a madman could even dream of a war between these two countries, and from our standpoint there is no possible reason which could justify it morally."

It is not the fact that a leader having obtained power, should alter his view which is characteristic of German mentality, but that absolutely opposed doctrines can be preached with a claim to the same obedience without anybody in Germany, either the prophet or his faithful, perceiving or wishing to perceive, this paradox.

Hitler in *Mein Kampf* formally maintains the inferiority of the Poles and sees (again italicised) "in any attempt at organising on the German frontiers a second military power, even if only in the form of the establishment of a state capable of becoming a military power, an attack on Germany and considers himself justified in opposing the establishment of such a state with all means in his power, including force, or to destroy such a state if it has already been founded." But Germany has guaranteed the frontiers to that very state and actually while it was under a military government, and the alliance between Germany and Poland is considered (1935) not only by the Führer, but by the majority of Germans, as one of the greatest and most tangible successes of National-Socialist foreign policy.

In 1934 the pamphlet *Germans, Frontiers Separate You*, issued in tens of thousands of copies, compares the blacksmith Adolf Krumm and the electrical engineer Erich Wicboldt, killed at Graudenz on November 26th, 1933, by the "Polish mob", with the popular hero Schlageter and makes of them "undying martyrs". It brands "the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Germans from Upper Silesia by the Poles" and "the systematic de-Germanisation of the Corridor and Posen" as "a Polish crime", an outrage of that very state which the Führer in his speech of the same year glorified as the most chivalrous of allies.

It would be wrong to consider these protestations, denied as soon as uttered, as a policy of lying. If they were and if their authors and their numerous followers considered them as such and only saw in them a means justified by love of country, the people, and above all the youth of Germany, would still be able to distinguish truth from falsehood, the possible from the impossible, and there would exist at least some resemblance between their mentality

and that of Western Europe. But every German National-Socialist longs for the total destruction of France and Poland with all his heart and from love of the future of his own nation. He is ready, at the same time—and in all good faith—to declare madmen all those who consider a conflict against these two nations possible. For the spirit of conquest in the Viking manner, which pitilessly demands the realisation of the first aim, exists in his mind side by side with the humanitarian ideal for his own person, for whom a defeat is still within the bounds of possibility. It would seem that this state of psychological contradiction and mystical unification of all possibilities were the aim of a part of the German nation, for which it is prepared to sacrifice everything, even its reason.

This fundamental characteristic of the German spirit—this reverence for authority in deeds and for democracy in words and the absolute faith in both—is revealed most strikingly in the eternal constitution of the Third Reich, the programme of the National-Socialist German Workers' Party, which was declared unalterable "after the most careful consideration" by the general meeting of May 22nd, 1926. This programme, which has remained unchanged to the present day, has been declared by the highest legal authorities of Germany the supreme basis of interpretation for all laws, either promulgated or to be promulgated. It concluded with the solemn words: "The leaders of the Party promise to work for the realisation of the foregoing articles, even if necessary at the cost of their lives." If, however, the programme be read with the care which is due to the political and spiritual foundation of the life of a great nation, one is astonished to discover that, apart from the points relating to the Jews, no attempt has been made to realise a single one of the articles of the programme and yet the faith of the masses in the divine nature of these fundamental principles or that of the leaders in their own logic has not been shaken in the slightest.

The advantages and disadvantages of a dictatorship compared with democratic government need not be discussed here. But is it possible to imagine that in Italy the head of the government should have distributed in thousands of copies a political programme of Fascism in which he proclaims as a condition indispensable for all

reforms the authority of a strong central parliament? But that is exactly what is happening in the Third Reich. The programme of the National-Socialist Party demands in the 25th and last article as an express condition for the realisation of all the foregoing points in its programme, "The absolute authority of the central political parliament over the whole Reich and its organisation in general." The German who would dare demand the fulfilment of this essential point of the programme would suffer the consequences as an incorrigible democrat, just as would anyone who allowed himself even to question the sacredness and the inviolability of the same programme. The blindly obstinate cult of these two aims characterises the profound emotional unity of the German people and its unconscious spiritual duality.

As far as the second essential point of any constitution is concerned, namely, who is to be considered as citizens and what are the rights and duties involved, the programme proclaims in Article XI the same rights and the same duties for all Germans, with the exception of the Jews, in particular the right of deciding on the government and the laws of the state. But after two years of National-Socialist activity, during which the rigorous realisation of the programme as the eternal basis of the Third Reich continued to be proclaimed, the Nuremberg Diet adopted unanimously a law dividing German citizens into two categories: one without political rights to which all those belong "who do not prove by their attitude that they are fully determined and capable of serving loyally the German nation and the Reich", the other, those of the citizens of the Reich who fulfil these conditions and are consequently the sole possessors of all political rights, with the restriction, however, that they must also obtain letters patent as citizens from the Reich. There is further a third category, that of the leaders who are outside of and above the laws, but this decree, which defames a large section of the German people and deprives them of civil rights on account of their opinions, does not mention them. The same youth of Germany which came in thousands to take the solemn oath to the programme of the Party heard the promulgation of this decree with prolonged applause.

In practice, if not in theory, what is more important still is the manner in which a State fills its leading posts. According to Article VI of the programme, war is declared on the "corrupt parliamentary system which distributed posts on party lines without consideration of the character or the abilities of the applicants". Already certain details, such as the typical agreement between the educational authorities of Lübeck and the leader of Section 187 of the Hitler Youth to allow "only those students who are sound from the political point of view and capable of being used in politics, to pass the matriculation examination" indicates the way in which the principle is being applied. But much more valuable evidence is to hand to prove that in the space of a year and a quarter after the coming to power of the National Socialists the highest posts were allotted to criminals who deserved death, i.e., the evidence of Hitler himself.

Hitler has admitted that the same thing took place during the National-Socialist Revolution as occurred during the revolution of November 1918, according to his first comrade Gottfried Feder in his commentary on the programme of the National-Socialists, i.e., "The sons of chaos—convicts occupied the highest and most lucrative posts in the State." In his address to the Reichstag on the 13th of July, 1934, Hitler declared in justification of the executions of June 30th: "Facts have shown that promotion to the position of leader in the S.A. had been made only from the angle of purely external abilities or even in many cases in terms of supposed intellectual capacities. . . . Whereas the brave veteran of the S.A. had often suffered privations for the Party for more than ten years, mercenary troops had been raised whose inner character and aims were best shown by the really terrible criminal record of some of the members. . . . Their life had become as bad as that of those whom we conquered and replaced in 1933. . . . What would have become of Germany if this brute had been victorious it is difficult to imagine. . . . I gave the order to burn down to the raw flesh the ulcers poisoning us at home and abroad," an order which, as is proved by the judgment of the Arbitration Court of the Party in the Kube case, it has not been possible to carry out to the present day.

Hitler himself in the speech to the Reichstag gave the number of those executed on June 30th, who had been appointed to leading positions under his régime, as sixty-eight, amongst whom were nineteen of the highest S.A. leaders. Otto Strasser in his book, quite wrongly entitled *The German St. Bartholomew*—for on St. Bartholomew's Eve it was religious opponents and not former friends who were massacred—gives the names of fifty-eight such leaders, including a minister of the Reich, the chiefs of police of Munich and Breslau, three army corps and nine brigade commanders, two propaganda chiefs, seven group leaders, three divisional, thirteen regimental and eighteen storm battalion leaders, together with the former organiser of the Party. Goebbels in his broadcast, said of his former comrade-in-arms, Heines, who a year before his execution had been appointed chief of police in Breslau by Hitler, that the repulsive homosexual scene on the occasion of his arrest baffled description. A book entitled *Our Leaders in the Light of the Racial Question and Characterology*, which appeared with the authorisation of the Party and police, gives the following portrait of this Heines (a report of whose trial in connection with a Feme murder had been issued at the time in thousands of copies by Hitler's publisher): "In him the spiritual side dominates the physical . . . versatile, energetic and combative, with a profound religious feeling . . . logical and objective thinker . . . an open and sincere fighter whose every act springs from a fanatical idealism." In what other country of the world could a leader have stated that the revolution, contrary to its programme, had appointed hundreds of criminals to leading positions only on the basis of Party service, without any consideration for their character or ability, and yet continue to advocate the same programme as if nothing had happened? Indeed after the executions, after the leaders and members of the S.A. had been executed in numbers which were estimated by objective observers at several hundreds, an order of the day was issued to the same S.A. which concluded with the words: "I wish that in the S.A. obedience, loyalty and comradeship prevail, and as every leader must demand obedience from his men, I demand that the leaders of the S.A. respect the law and obey my

order." This appeal to comradeship and to respect of law was issued on the very day that comrades executed comrades in defiance of all law. If lying were an integral part of German mentality such an appeal could never have been made. It is characteristic of the National-Socialists of our day, because they have ceased to be conscious of the contradiction existing between their actions and their words. How is it conceivable otherwise that the élite of the youth of the movement, the S.A. soldiers, could have rejoiced on June 30th at the execution of so many of their leaders to whom they had sworn fidelity and whom they had acclaimed the day before with equal enthusiasm.

Article IX, "the heart of the programme", according to Feder, demands the breaking of the bondage of interest, Article XIII the nationalisation of all existing trusts, Article XIV participation of the workers in the profits of the great enterprises, Article XV a generous extension of old-age pensions, Article XVI the immediate municipalisation of the big stores, which are to be let at low rates to small shopkeepers.

The actions consisted in an increase of the interest-bearing national debt by forty thousand million gold marks in four years, constant efforts (1934, 1935) to obtain loans from London—although according to the Führer "the struggle against international capital has become the heart of the struggle of Germany for its liberty and economic independence". There is no news up to the present of any nationalisation of the I.G. Farben (the chemical industries of Germany) nor that the workers are sharing in the profits of the Thyssen, Krupp, Kirstein or Otto Wolff works. Other nations may have difficulty in seeing a development of old-age pensions and social insurance in the reduction of the annuities and the fall in their real purchasing power. In not a single case have the stores taken from the Jews become municipal property, nor have they been let to small shopkeepers either at high or low rents. Not a single point of the programme has been realised. But this does not prevent its continuing to stir the enthusiasm of the masses and being distributed in millions of copies.

The power of being able to see black as white and yet at the

same time to feel and describe it as black is anything but limited to the leaders, but permeates all classes of the nation to such an extent that one example for many will suffice—an everyday banal example, but all the more typical for that. In August 1935 an American, the owner of bonds in a German firm, sued for payment of outstanding interest from American capital held by the firm. The firm objected that German currency legislation prohibited it from making such a payment. The American judges gave judgment against the firm on the grounds that it accepted the payments of its American debtors and that therefore it was impossible to refuse this same money to its American creditors. The case itself is of no particular interest to-day, nor is the attitude of the German firm, but what is significant is the way the German press unanimously reacted towards it. "The judgment," maintained the financial editor of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, in full agreement with all other economic periodicals, "is remote from reality, pharisaical and dangerous. The conception of property can only be shaken by such a crude principle of mortgage and self-payment." Hence it is not the prohibition made by German lawgivers to repay a foreign creditor who is helping German industry which shakes the idea of property, but the repayment of that creditor from the capital which his debtor had been able to amass in that country thanks to its economic liberalism. At bottom every German is sincerely convinced of his sacred right not to pay his commercial debts to a foreign creditor. On the other hand he can demand that the foreign debtor be forced to pay him. This is the principle which he has formulated as a general truth in defence of the idea of property against the destructive bolshevism of the Western democracies. In view of this it is easy to understand that the danger for the German nation and what makes Germany so dangerous for other countries are not conscious ambiguities, but the unconscious psychological necessity of regarding the destruction of property as the protection of property, economic dictatorship as economic liberty and of feeling itself not the champion of this dictatorship but a defender of freedom. •

This confusion of ideas and feeling does not occur solely where

foreign countries are concerned, but is equally prominent with regard to Germany itself. The population of Germany is predominantly urban. In 1927 two-thirds of the population lived in towns, more than a quarter in big towns with a population of over a hundred thousand, and this transformation of an agrarian into an industrial and urban country is the cause of the German economic upswing during the nineteenth century.

In 1800 Germany had twenty-four and a half million inhabitants of whom twenty-two million lived on the land while only two and a half million inhabited the towns. In 1925 the rural population, still about twenty-two million, had remained stationary, whereas the population of the towns had increased from two and a half million to forty. Nevertheless, although Germany owes its rise and greatness to the growth of its city population, the glorification of blood and soil, the contempt for towns and particularly for the big towns, the hatred of the mechanisation and industrialisation of life has nowhere assumed such a religious character as in National-Socialist doctrine, which gained in this way many of its numerous followers especially amongst German youth.

Not only Darré but Hitler also described the peasant "As the foundation of the whole nation," before whom industry and commerce must withdraw from their unhealthy leading position. Fritsch, in his *Handbook on the Jewish Question*, specially recommended by the Führer, exclaimed: "Away from the plague spot Berlin," and none of the great and insignificant writers of National-Socialism lack this hatred of the town and the soul-destroying machine. Now it would be conceivable that Germany should attempt to retrace the path along which it moved forward during the nineteenth century and that the Germans should be made once more a peasant folk bound to the soil, while Russia, on the other hand, strives to make itself an industrial and urban country. But while the German press is preaching the love of the soil and its importance for German blood, even to the point of maintaining that "only the products of German soil can create German blood", every German with the second part of his soul admires just as passionately the achievements of German technology and sees in

them the basis for German prestige in the world. That is the peculiarity of the German mentality—that it succeeds in reconciling a mystical glorification of the peasants and a contempt for urban activities with a great pride in German technical achievements, and that the dream of the Führer of giving productive employment to a population of two hundred and fifty million, which could only be realised by an intensive industrialisation and increased urbanisation of the country is no obstacle to the campaign aiming at the annihilation of that characteristic product of the towns, the faith in technical achievement which is simultaneously the idol of the Germans.

Article XXIV of the National-Socialist programme recognises liberty of conscience and Christianity, and within these limits proclaims a policy of non-intervention in confessional disputes. The Führer emphasises these principles in his book: "The religious institutions of his people should always be inviolable to the political leader, otherwise he should not be a politician but a reformer if he possesses the necessary gifts. Any other attitude would, particularly in Germany, lead to catastrophe." Again, that the co-operation of the congregation in the choice of their pastors should be abolished, that the leaders of the established church should be prevented from preaching, that pastors should be dismissed and others appointed, that a bishop for the whole Empire should be appointed and then shortly afterwards dismissed in favour of a collegiate authority under the Ministry, need not be considered a peculiar symptom of German mentality because in other nations likewise early speeches of pretenders to power were denied at a later date by the ruler. What is characteristic is that the doctrine of the catastrophic consequences for the State as a result of intervention in religious quarrels still continues to be hammered into the minds of countless students and soldiers in all schools and labour camps by Hitler's book with all the force of a dogma. The principle of the inviolability of religious institutions remains a sacred article of faith as inviolable as the diametrically opposed practice equally authorised by the Führer. Despite the fact that they are mutually exclusive both have the force of law in Germany. For

as Rothenberger, the president of the Hanscatic Court of Appeal maintained in a lecture: "The words of the Führer made public in any special form, as, for instance, a proclamation at the Diet of the Party or to the Reichstag, or the judgment and execution order of June 30th, are principles of law and must be applied by the judge," and "similarly, the book *Mein Kampf* and the speeches of the Führer are valid sources for the interpretation of all law".

As for the protection of liberty of conscience and the practice of Christianity, solemnly guaranteed in the charter of National-Socialism, this is what happened under the indulgent eye of the authorities at a meeting of 18,000 people in Berlin, according to the correspondent of the moderately liberal *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*: "When Reventlow declared that the power of the Church would be broken, a dissenter in the audience shouted 'Never.' Immediately a large number of young men pounced on him, kicked and beat him and dragged him out of the hall. This was the signal for a series of acts of violence against the small minority of listeners who had expressed their disapproval in any way, either by murmurs or facial expression. Meanwhile fierce hand-to-hand struggles were taking place on the platform, people were trampled under foot and thrown out. In the hall, lads in uniform pulled their opponents from their seats in the audience, chased them for dear life down the aisles and dragged them outside by the hair. After these examples of an incredible brutality, the speakers went on blandly discoursing on liberty of conscience. A young man who smiled at this was attacked by some twenty men who drew rubber truncheons from under their coats and beat their victim until he was unconscious, after which they kicked him in the face." Such brutalities are not peculiar to the modern German mentality. They may occur in any country during a period of fanaticism, but what is unique is the proclamation of perfect freedom of conscience and the practice of its opposite at one and the same time, and equally their anger at anyone who should even hint at the impossibility of such a contradiction. For such a one is indeed a traitor to the German faith, to that mystical conception of the world according

to which the German soul, and it alone, is capable of uniting in inner harmony such contradictions as Valhalla and Christianity, liberty of conscience and compulsory acceptance of prescribed beliefs. Only thus is it possible to explain how Hitler could boast in one of his most solemn declarations (the speech on the occasion of Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations) that "he had put an end to the attacks on religion and the denial of God" (by which only the Christian God could have been meant) and shortly afterwards call upon the spirit of the dead Hindenburg to ride forth into Valhalla, a place very foreign to positive Christianity.

Just as a race of townfolk has a mystical admiration for the peasant and a nation of Christians reverences paganism, the typical modern German worships at one and the same time an ideal and its diametrical opposite, in little things as in big things and in every sphere of life. On August 23rd, 1935, Goebbels declared in an official address to the International Congress of Penal and Prison Law: "The National-Socialist form of State is not so undemocratic as it may appear at first sight. If the real aim of democracy is to show the way to labour and peace, then this true democracy is realised in Germany." Is it conceivable that a Bolshevik would take the trouble of trying to prove to an international audience that his party has in actual fact realised the aims of liberal capitalism? As every typical German, however, admires dictatorship in one corner of his heart and Western democracy in the other, he is capable of feeling and presenting these contradictions as a unity.

This peculiar power frequently leads to grotesque situations obvious to all but the actors themselves. Thus the National-Socialist Union of Teachers, the greatest organisation of German teachers, demanded in a printed resolution a tax on words of foreign origin in printed works as it is imperative for the new Germany to have a spiritual autarchy of Nordic blood. But as the old Germany with its deep respect for everything foreign continues to exert undiminished its influence within the Union of Teachers, they apparently did not notice that their very name contains the foreign words "national" and "socialist" and that they would therefore

have to pay the tax twice themselves. Similarly persuasive letters were written as part of an official tourist propaganda to foreigners, whose names obviously proclaimed them Jews, on the same day that a decree was published forbidding even foreign Jews to take part in the October Festival at Munich. For the old idea of German hospitality and the new one of protection against pollution by contact with foreigners still live with equal force and harmony in the same heads. Similarly, the National Congress of Popular Hygiene at which the chief medical officer of the Reich, Wagner, was present in his official capacity, and which, according to its official figures, has over twelve million supporters, on the 9th of May, opposed the inoculation of mice and guinea pigs and naturally vaccination as well "to exterminate the Jewish spirit". On the 10th of May, however, the National-Socialist government of Saxony dissolved the anti-vaccination associations and the anti-vaccination Union of Doctors for demagogic propaganda against science. For love of racial purity and of nature causes those to despise science who have always had in their blood the German respect for scientific knowledge. At the time of the Belgian lawsuit which, after a public trial and negotiations lasting several days, deprived four Belgians, accused of high treason, of their nationality, the German press lamented the fate of these four men now without a country, and the German Reich officially protested through its Ambassador against the verdict. Yet, with a stroke of the pen, the same Germany deprives of their country hundreds of its Christian and Jewish citizens on account of their views. But there is no hypocrisy here. On the contrary, the ideals of humanity are still so vital—of course only in so far as the fate of National-Socialists is concerned—that the outcry of the German press is absolutely sincere and as sincere as the Nordic conviction of the absurdity of any display of humanity towards political opponents who as sub-humans do not deserve the fate of men but that of animals.

The craving to consider oneself as the freest of heroes and prophets of the new ideas and, at the same time, as a victim of persecution forced to defend himself—a phenomenon which is not to be found in any other revolutionary movement, has its source in

the same psychological attitude. The German leaders and the German press are continually talking of Jewish provocations in Germany which had led to all the legal coercive measures and the constant attacks on Jews in streets, cafés and businesses in German towns. But at the same time these Jews, each of whom though unarmed has the courage to provoke a hundred armed opponents, are described as the most cowardly creatures in the world, as such vermin that every kind of terroristic act is permissible against them. The Nordic mentality in its childlike innocence spills blood with a holy joy, this spirit of the Viking which "plays ball with enemy babies and catches them on the point of the spear" is, in spite of everything, as powerful in every German at any moment as the Christian faith which only permits violence in self-defence. That is why the National-Socialist, the fearless and free hero, sees himself continually obliged to excuse his actions by means of fictitious dangers. "A Jewish hawker bites German sheep dog." This telegram, said to have been sent from Germany, expresses excellently the desire of every German National-Socialist to appear simultaneously as persecuted innocence and as an irresistible force of nature.

All revolutions up to the present, despite many differences, have always had one point in common—their fanaticism was never ashamed of the actions it gave rise to. Cromwell, Jan von Leyden, Calvin, Robespierre, Trotsky and Lenin never suppressed but rather favoured the knowledge of their terroristic measures and deeds of bloodshed as the logical consequence of their doctrines. The National-Socialist Revolution likewise makes use of an immense propaganda to impose Nordic ideas, but at the same time it seeks to conceal from the foreigner the deeds resulting from these ideas. That is why twelve representatives of great foreign newspapers were expelled and twenty others were refused an extension of their permits to stay in the country, not because their reports were subjectively coloured but because they were truly objective. A journalist, Schwertfeger, who informed foreign correspondents of an order issued by Goebbels and permeated by the spirit of National-Socialism, was sentenced to penal servitude for

life for high treason. Danton would have conferred on a writer who published his decrees the freedom of the city of Paris.

Jewish lawyers, the majority of whom had fought in the War, were compelled to give up their posts within twenty-four hours, but the order was not issued in the form of a public decree but by individual notice so that this measure remains concealed from the masses to the present day. In place of public sentence on political opponents many of these have been shot while attempting to escape. This must be regarded as secret executions because the belief, both at home and abroad, in the vigilance of German escorts remains unshaken. Torturings and executions in concentration camps likewise take place in secret and not with that subjective consciousness of justice which enabled the French rulers of 1793 to proclaim to the whole world the equally terrible September murders as a necessity for the salvation of the fatherland. The revolutionary songs of the National-Socialists, the song "When Jewish blood spurts under the knife it will be all the better for us, comrades; hang the Jew, hang the nigger on the wall!" are reserved for home consumption. The National-Socialist song-book, which despite many efforts I have not been able to obtain through any foreign bookseller, is not sent abroad. It is as if the Jacobins had kept secret the "*Ça ira*" or the "*Marseillaise*". The French and the Russian revolutions were more bloody than the German, but they had a better conscience.

A strange revolution which certainly acts up to its principles, but is at the same time ashamed of them. The German complaints about atrocity stories, which continually recur in the speeches of the Führer and his lieutenants, spring from the same psychological source. These stories have the peculiarity that the facts underlying them appear to every National-Socialist as true and worthy of an heroic community, but become for him as soon as they cross the frontiers, infamous lies. How many of the stories are true or false is no longer of any interest, since the refusal of medicaments to the sick Jews in the provinces, the exclusion of Jews blinded in the War from the German Associations for the Blind and the approval of the murder of the ex-premier of Bavaria, Kahr, have

become law. A single quotation will therefore suffice to show with what satisfaction the official press within the German frontiers reports actions of its leaders which are considered by the same Germany as atrocity stories when published unaltered by the emigrant weekly *Das Neue Tagebuch*. "Dr. Steinruck, a well-known personality in Nuremberg, was said to have expressed the wish in a conversation in a café that the same fate might befall Herr Streicher as had overtaken Röhm. The National-Socialist *Frankische Kurier* reports the consequences in Streicher's own words: "Some gentlemen who heard this went up to Steinruck and said to him that if he said anything of the sort again he would get a thrashing. Thereafter Steinruck was silent. The next day the S.A. heard of the affair and wanted to lynch him. I asked the police to take the man into protective custody and this was done. I went to Dr. Martin the chief of police and said, 'I should like to have a look at this man, for I cannot believe that he can really have said it.' Together with several members of the party I went into the cell and saw a little man in front of me. He began to speak in a whining tone and behaved like a cur. He did not behave like the man whom one had expected to see after his big talk. Hereupon I horsewhipped him in accordance with the ordinance."

That a German leader protected by an escort of supporters should horsewhip a weak and defenceless prisoner before members of his party and under the indulgent eye of the chief of police, although according to his own statement he is doubtful of his guilt, may be an isolated instance, but what is characteristic is the arrogant tone of the report, the profound conviction that this act reveals the heroism of the Nordic soul. It is the same kind of mentality which mocks a feeble adversary and appeals to the pity of the world against a strong one; which glorifies even to-day the Brest-Litowsk peace as a German necessity against the cowardly Bolsheviks while cursing the Treaty of Versailles as a barbaric injustice of an insolent victor; which accuses before the whole world the foreign Jews who boycott Germany of conspiring against peace and maintains that the starvation of the Jews in Germany is an internal matter for Germany alone; which jeers at

the German workers as cowards when they do not defend themselves against the armed S.A. soldiers and brands them as incendiaries if they do so; which has posters put up at every street corner in Berlin: "German comrade, do you know that the Jew rapes your child, dishonours your wife, dishonours your sister, dishonours your fiancée, murders your parents, steals your property, sneers at your honour, mocks at your customs, destroys your children, ruins your culture, contaminates your race, that Jewish doctors are slowly murdering you?", while at the same time protesting bitterly against the foreign campaign of lies against German culture. The Germans are so sensitive to all criticism of their own national and racial thought that scientific bodies such as the Society of Legal and Social Medicine at its 22nd Congress demand penal servitude (Alfred Rosenberg even advocates the death penalty) for those who offend in this way.

This remarkable excess of violent measures and speeches on the one hand and this exaggerated sensibility on the other, have their cause in the feeling of uncertainty which compels the German mind in consequence of its historical evolution during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to adore and practise violence, tradition, racial purity and uniformity, and in the same breath to deny them to others. His glorification of force suffers from the fact that Germany during the last war was defeated by force. The warlike speeches aim at drowning the secret fear of a repetition, while at the same time foreign nations are reassured by protestations of peace.

To be less hampered in this reverence of their own violence most Germans desire, half consciously, half sub-consciously, to forget their military defeats—interspersed with great victories—during the Great War, to forget the decisive battle of the Marne and the useless blood-bath of Verdun. One of their leaders, Goebbels, as late as 1934, emphatically maintained in his *Essence and Form of National Socialism*, and that in spite of the immobilisation of the decisive fronts during the War: "We Germans won the War brilliantly from the military standpoint, but politically we lost it all along the line."

As for tradition, Germany is well aware in its heart that a Prussian tradition, of fairly recent date at that, undoubtedly exists, but that there is no national tradition. As a result of historical catastrophes no country in the world is so lacking in tradition. This race of whose very name there is no record before the tenth century, only arose long after the conversion to Christianity of the Germanic tribes and no desire, however ardent, no Richard Wagner, no Frau General Ludendorff, can revive the Germanic gods, who were dead even before Christianity buried them.

Similarly the dream of the Holy Roman Empire collapsed with the fall of Hohenstaufen. In spite of the revival of such mediaeval terms for their military formations as bans and storms, despite all forced enthusiasm, not the faintest living trace of the feudal spirit or of chivalry has survived. Even the bridge to the ideas of the sixteenth century was carried away by the sea of blood of the Peasant Wars and the Thirty Years War, just as that to the eighteenth century was destroyed by the victory of Bismarck and Prussia. In contrast to the English, whose democratic tradition goes back almost a thousand years, and to the French for whom Napoleon's glory was a direct continuation of the tradition of Louis XIV, "*Le Roi soleil*", every epoch in German history is separated by a gulf from the one following, so that the desire to invent a tradition corresponds to the complete lack of such tradition.

Finally, as far as the purity of German blood is concerned, the words of Gottfried Feder, the founder of the National-Socialist movement, need only be quoted: "We must clearly realise," says he in his programme of the National-Socialist Party, "that the German people have been bastardised to such an extent that in the long run not very much can be made of it," and for that very reason he demands, with the naïveté of the theorist, the "Nordicisation" of the German people—as if means were available to transform bastard blood into pure blood.

This is the strange and tragic division within the soul of modern Germany. A race without tradition desires to possess one and lashes itself into enthusiasm for a fictitious one. A nation which did not succeed in conquering a world of enemies by force suppresses the

natural course of this defeat by falsifying the reality which it actually experienced, thus preserving for itself the illusion of victory. A people whose greatness is based upon the multiplicity of its branches and of its blood submits itself to a single idea under a single leader.

But in the midst of this nation thirsting for a tradition yet lacking it, of this people of conquered victors and this mixture of races dreaming of an impossible racial purity, the German Jews lived, a branch of a race rich in tradition (even though for the moment it disdains that tradition) which amongst all European peoples has preserved relatively the greatest racial purity without appreciating it, a community always defeated yet never conquered.

These characteristics so opposed to those of the Germans did indeed make of them a foreign body within modern Germany, however great their desire to be absorbed in it. For though they were willing and capable of accepting another tradition, even the Prussian tradition, in the place of their own (as many of them did with enthusiasm), they could not accept a fictitious German tradition, an imaginary Wotan or Widuking instead of a living Christ or Moses. They could not despise the purity of their own blood in order to revere the non-existent purity of a foreign race, they could not admire as victors a nation which was suffering the greatest defeat in its history, they could not believe in fables and legends at a time when they had rejected their own. Consequently they were bound to appear malevolent critics and hard matter-of-fact-realists in the midst of visionary and enthusiastic romantics who drew and still draw from the unreality of their dreams their self-esteem and their hope of a final victory.

What did it profit them that the best amongst them correctly gauged the relative strength of the combatants during the War, not for the sake of Judaism, but of Germany, or that Rathenau first opposed the unconditional surrender and then in Genoa regained for the German nation a place amongst the other nations, since neither he nor his community could feel defeat as victory, legend as truth or force as God. The man wrapt in a holy dream hates no one more than him who tries to wake him out of his wild

ecstasy. The fate of Rathenau proves this, the "accursed Jewish swine" to whose murderers the Third Reich, quite logically, erects monuments and whose names have been given to new military formations in eternal memory—at the same time as Wolfgang Diewerge in his *Fall Gustloff* (published by Franz Eher, Hitler's publisher) brands the attempt on Gustloff's life as a dastardly crime.

The German-Jewish community, so different in its spiritual history from the German nation, became more alien to it than ever as a result of the political fate of the Germans and their new mentality. A people which wishes to consider itself victorious can only tolerate its defeat by attributing it to treason. Hence the curious legend so popular amongst typical Germans to-day that the Jews caused the War and then the final defeat, although at the beginning of the War there was not a Jew among German or foreign diplomats, nor one amongst the German generals and statesmen who lost the War. But the more absurd the idea that the Jews, whose economic power was based on international trade and international relations destroyed by the War, could have had any interest in bringing it about, the more this idea, which has become a dogma of the religion preaching a world conspiracy of the Jews, dominates the German mind.

For it represents escape into an imaginary realm where the German can continue to believe in his love of peace and in his invincibility. That is also why Germany, wrongly seeing in its mixed blood an indelible shame, takes refuge in the idea that the race would have been pure if it had not been contaminated by intermixture with a minority representing 1/100 of its population—as if, according to its own ethnologists, the proportion of Mongolian blood did not amount to 2% for Germany as a whole and even 4% in the eastern areas, that is to say, twice the proportion represented by the Jewish population.

Nevertheless, the profound antipathy born of the different evolution of German and Jewish character since the middle of the eighteenth century, would not have resulted in such fanatical outbursts of rage if the Germans had not preserved intact one of their former qualities—that of being a docile and suffering nation.

The Germans consider themselves as a race of heroes, rightly pointing to their exploits in the wars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But heroism is anything but a simple notion. Bravery may be an individual quality akin to the taste for adventure, in which the love of danger overcomes the fear of death. It may equally be a product of social passivity, of a deeply-rooted discipline which evolves no plans, but which carries out the plans of others even at the risk of possible destruction and which supports for the sake of a beloved leader, the greatest sufferings without a murmur. Whether active heroism was more prominent among the Germans than among the other nations may well be doubted, as the officers and men in both camps gave many examples of individual bravery and sublime contempt for death. What distinguished the Germans more than the others and enabled them to withstand a host of enemies for years was not the bravery of a Richthofen or of a Weddigen, which can be paralleled by the audacity of a Lawrence, but the capacity of the German people to endure sufferings and misery, privations and epidemics to a greater extent than would have been possible in any other country. What Germany actively performed during the World War is paralleled by the efforts of its opponents. What it passively endured is unexampled in history. It is already worthy of the highest admiration that a community should have been able to resist so long without milk or butter, with bread consisting for the most part of maize and bran, with substitutes for eggs and 20 grammes of meat a day, regardless of the starvation of their children and the wasting away of their wives. It is astonishing that until the end of the War the Germans accepted this without rebellion and that until the last months of 1917 there had not been a single outburst of indignation in the factories, scarcely even an isolated murmur among the queues lined up in front of the shops. But what really is astounding is that when, after months of infinite suffering and proofs of super-human patience, these same people saw the army capitulate overnight on the orders of Ludendorff, they not only accepted then the reproach of having stabbed the army in the back, but enthusiastically repeat that reproach to-day. What a nation of martyrs

which finds its martyrdom so natural that it believes it did not suffer too much but too little!

Just as the German nation was decimated during the Thirty Years War in order that the principle "*Cuius Regio, illius religio*" should give the princes freedom to determine the religion of their subjects, just as the wars of Frederick the Great were pure wars of conquest waged to maintain dynastic claims on Silesia, just as no crime of the German rulers in the eighteenth century, such as the sale of soldiers to foreign powers for cash in order to raise money for an ostentatious but uncultured court, could shake the devotion of the subject to each one of their little princes, so to-day the reverence of the Germans for their leaders has remained their most intense feeling and produces an heroic mentality which is capable of any sacrifice for the beliefs prescribed by the leaders and blindly accepted. According to a remark of E. M. Arndt, quoted by Riccarda Huch, if the devil himself were to come out of Hell to make himself their Emperor, the Germans would immediately construct for him a genealogical tree establishing his right to the title and would go on touching him up until he appeared white instead of black. No nation in the world has ever provided for its victorious leaders such a splendid funeral as was given by the Germans in Berlin to General von Kluck, the general who lost the battle of the Marne. Irrespective of whether the princes had fled or remained, the Republican governments of the German states considered it just to compensate their former rulers for the loss of their rights. In the dreams of young girls, which are as characteristic of the mentality of a people as the creations of its artists, the lieutenant was and still is, the ideal obedient ruler, the man whom no feminine heart can resist. The Social-Democratic leader, Ludwig Frank, a Jew but with the typical German mentality, "left for the front with joy" as he said in one of his last letters, as soon as he had received the order for the war which he had for years opposed. It is said that the German Communists, when in November they went to plunder the shops for red material for their flags, turned back for requisition orders when these were demanded by the shopkeepers.

That German judges obey National-Socialist laws and that they forget from one day to the next the principles they held before, can happen in any nation. But the delight in obedience, the excessive zeal in legal interpretation, are typically German. In a verdict given on the 26th of August, 1935, and proudly preserved in its official archives, the Supreme Court declares that the supposition that a legitimate daughter of Aryan parents might have been the fruit of adultery with a Jew long dead was sufficient to render invalid her marriage with a National-Socialist, concluded twenty-five years later. A Jew who kissed an Aryan girl against her will was condemned by an elastic interpretation of the Nuremburg laws to fifteen months' penal servitude for attempted racial violation. A Jew who kissed a girl with her consent was condemned to one year's imprisonment for assault of the family.

German scientists themselves are just as eager to submit to the spirit of the mighty even when their post is not at stake. The privy councillor Planck, President of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, Nobel Prize Winner, whose position and influence safeguard him from any attempt at persecution, sent a telegram to the Führer on the third anniversary of his accession to power, assuring him that science could "only" progress under his government. Whereupon, more or less in reply to this telegram, an article appeared in the *Volksischer Beobachter* violently demanding that the same Institute should be prohibited from opening the section devoted to the history of civilisation: it was not nationalistic enough in colour.

The spirit in which the President of the Reichstag, Count Ballestrem, signed in 1913 the address sent to Wilhelm II, on the 25th anniversary of his rule with the words, "Your humble servant, dying with devotion," is exactly that which erects a monument to Darré during his lifetime and allows him to listen with emotion to the panegyric on himself at its inauguration. In Scandinavia, England or France, the absurdity of the situation would have been sufficient to make both politicians quite impossible.

This unconditional respect for ruling governments makes Germany the classical militaristic country. For the decisive factor in the militarisation of a nation is not whether it is more or less armed,

but whether the spirit of submission, of ready sacrifice and of blind confidence in its leaders dominates every sphere of life and makes the means of power an end in themselves.

That is why Switzerland is not militarised, although in some respects relatively more highly armed than Germany, since every man liable to be called to the colours is obliged to spend so much time every year in shooting-practice and to put in extra time on it should he fail to reach the minimum standard. It is not the military commanders, not the generals, nor the higher officers who inspire the Swiss with the greatest respect, but the sober statesman who in constant contact with the citizens prudently watches over the fate of the nation which he not only has to lead but also to convince. In England the officers not on active service wear civilian clothes. In Germany the success of National-Socialism may be partially explained by the fact that it gratifies the heart's desire of the civilian to wear uniform after he has left his office. Even in France where military fame is highly honoured the ambition of the Field Marshals is to become members of the Académie Française, whereas in Germany writers are organised on a military footing in official departments for art and culture. No nation, consequently, has such a love of titles and decorations as the German, since these prove that the superiors have been satisfied with the opinions of the subordinates. No nation has such a clear conscience despite all the acts of violence which are perpetrated in its midst, because each individual who commits them has the consciousness of acting on the order of a higher instance. As for the leader at any given moment, he has no responsibility because he is only the first servant of the State and devotion to this deified Father relieves him of all guilt. That is why the Führer in his speech at the tomb of Gustloff could "solemnly maintain that not a single murdered opponent, not a single outrage lay across the path which National-Socialism is following". He had not forgotten the assassinations of Erzberger, of Rathenau, of Theodor Lessing, of Erich Mühsam nor the Jews who died in Glogau and in Hirschberg on the 30th of June, Dr. Förster, Dr. Zweig, Dr. Chorig, Oppenheim, Senr. and Junr., Dr. Lindemann and Dr. Jacobson, nor his congratulations

to the murderers condemned at Potempa. Their death for him was not a crime, much rather a sacrifice ordered by the god of Germany to save the nation. That is why, again according to him, National-Socialism "has never harmed Judaism", for if the scapegoat could understand the religious commandment it could not but feel that to be sacrificed was an honour.

Typical Germans love dictatorship for itself, apart from the aim it is following, because they are a naturally docile people. It is the spirit of Langemarck, where the soldiers gladly died without asking why—merely to raise the question would be sacrilege. It is the same spirit which strives for racial purity in order to dominate the world and for the domination of the world in order to achieve racial purity, which glorified Bismarck after his victory and forgot him after his fall, who transformed Wilhelm II, Hindenburg and Hitler into idols of the nation simply because they were leaders. This spirit ever obeys and never rules, for the real government in Germany continues to be the class which has never been converted to the idea of Germany, which never was accepted or desired to be accepted as the representative German type, which formerly was not liberal nor later Bismarckian nor to-day National-Socialist, namely, the Prussian Junkers, who remained Prussian and whose power neither Frederick the Great nor Bismarck dared to attack, who caused the downfall of Baron von Stein and only leave to National-Socialism to-day the trappings of power.

Like all true masters who consider the nation as their property and not themselves as belonging to it, they are prepared to accept every sacrifice which their subjects will make for them and prefer a new world war to the danger of expropriation. That Germany is governed by a small group of nobles which has never become German and national but has always remained Prussian, was shown on June 30th by the extermination of the Brown Shirts who were, for them, a special menace, by the dissolution of the Schlageter Associations, by the agrarian policy of Darré, by the commercial policy of Schacht and more recently by the colonial policy of Goebbels. Hitler has never deigned to reply to the reproaches made to him for deviation from the Party programme. When, however,

the big Prussian landowners saw themselves threatened by Article XVII, which demands "an agrarian reform in accordance with our national needs, a law of expropriation without compensation in the public interest and the suppression of ground-rent", he gave for the one and only time an explanation of the said article in order to reply to "the lying interpretations of our adversaries. As the National-Socialist Party takes its stand on the basis of private property, it is obvious that the words "expropriation without compensation" only applied to the creation of legal possibilities of expropriating, if necessary, land which has been unlawfully acquired or which is not administered in the interests of the people. It is therefore directed in the first place against the Jewish societies speculating in real estate" (which till then had not been known to possess land suitable in any way for agrarian reform). The vehemence of the denial is justified by the gravity of the accusation: what greater reproach could be made to a German revolutionary than that he should be contemplating action against the real government of Germany, the Prussian Junkers?

For this race of submissive heroic martyrs, the revolt in the Cabinet, led by the president of the "Nobles Club" and by one of Hindenburg's neighbours, to bring about the fall of Schleicher became a revolution "changing the course of history". Every individual, completely misunderstanding his own nature, considers himself an active hero, strives to imitate the mentality of a leader and looks down on the vulgar mass of German Jews who, in their turn, consider themselves a community of martyrs and are, in fact, as little martyrs as the Germans are active heroes. For victims of persecution are only martyrs when they submit to the persecution passively and with resignation to the will of God, an attitude anything but characteristic either of the murdered Jews such as Lessing, Eisner or Harden or of the Jewish assassins Friedrich Adler, Dora Kaplan or David Frankfurter. For despite the Jewish horror of bloodshed—in 1900 their share in the murders in Germany was only a quarter of what it should have been according to their proportion of the population and was nil during the period from 1911 to 1917—many of their intellectuals only seem to be able to

overcome their atavistic aversion from murder when no harm has been done to them personally but when humanity has been outraged by their opponents. The result is that the typical Germans of our time—all soldiers whose officers are recruited only from the non-national class of Prussian Junkers—believe themselves to be an individual community consisting of leaders of humanity and take the German Jews, who all aspire to be officers, for a homogeneous group of passive martyrs. This antagonism between a marvellously disciplined mass, respectfully in love with a non-national class of leaders and considering itself as a race of leaders, and an ethnical fraction consisting exclusively of individuals is the deepest cause of the hatred on the one side and the contempt on the other.

The question still remains to be answered why Germany to-day, as represented by National-Socialism, is sympathetic to the Prussian nobility and hostile to the Jewish community, seeing that the mentality of both are equally foreign to it.

Every submissive and disciplined creature needs a concrete ideal on which to concentrate all its love and an opposing type on which it can release all its violent instincts. It is of no consequence whether in reality the characters thus decked out with all the virtues and all the vices really deserve them. The important thing is that the believer feels himself akin to the persons whom he loves so that he can identify himself with them and not reject them as "alien".

Frederick II, Bismarck, Wilhelm II, Hindenburg or Hitler did not or do not possess in reality the qualities which the Germans attribute to them. Frederick the Great, according to the modern German legend a sincere lover of Germany and his people, was an atheistic French sceptic and despot of genius, despising the *Canaille*, as it pleased him to call the masses. Bismarck was no reckless daredevil as the Germans now picture him, who challenged the world for death or victory, but an outstanding and cautious diplomat who had to fight desperately all his life to keep his nerves under control. Wilhelm II—the first German Emperor worthy of the name, according to Houston Stewart Chamberlain—was a man intoxicated with words, eternally disappointed by the resistance of the world. Hindenburg, at first elected by the Right

and governing with the Left, then elected by the Left and governing with the Right, and finally coming to terms with the National-Socialists whom he had sworn a year before he would never allow to take power—even if we do not accept the depreciatory characterisation of him given by his collaborator Ludendorff—can scarcely be called a symbol of German fidelity, though certainly a Prussian general faithful to his group. However that may be, all these German heroes are certainly not what the Germans imagine them to be, but they are not alien to them, whereas the Jew is presented to them from infancy as the foreigner and hence the enemy and is therefore well fitted to embody all that makes them fearful.

The foreigner and therefore the enemy! That is really the attitude and even the philosophy of the German nation which their leading prophet, the professor of Political Law, Karl Schmitt, proclaims as the fundamental principle of the State. This primitive belief, or rather this belief of primitive peoples is also known to other nations and invariably manifests itself in wartime. The Germans prevented by defeat from expressing prematurely their aversion from everything foreign have happily found an outlet in their hatred of the Jews. Here they can realise the dream of victory, otherwise unrealisable. Here they have the foreigner, the devil, in the midst of the nation and his expulsion and death is bound to bring paradise on earth. It is at this point that the problem of the German hatred of the Jews touches a general human problem. The belief that the foreigner is the enemy has long been in conflict in most other nations with the knowledge that he can also be a friend. In Germany it has become the nightmare of a nation which has the feeling that it cannot live as long as anyone lives who differs from it. Hence the thirst for world domination or death, which is characteristic of German mentality and German education. In the German youth camps, German lads swear to die for Germany, but never to live for the world. The German measures against the Jews are the signs of a new struggle for world domination (as in all National-Socialist writings the struggle of the German spirit against the Jewish is termed, as though there

were no other types of mentality), and it is thus conceived by National-Socialism itself. At the moment the Jew is the incarnation of the foreigner, the non-German and he must die that Germany may live.

It is possible that another Germany will one day arise as formerly another existed. It is possible that the German writers now in exile, that a Thomas Mann and an Oskar Maria Graf, together with the German scientists who are at present silent, and the German workers whose hands are shackled, will again come to be regarded as typical Germans both by Germany and the world. But at the moment the essence of German national character is to hate the foreigner because he is a foreigner, to love dictatorship because it is power, to hate reason because it is the friend of truth. If this national character should change as it has so often done in the past the consequences for both parties would nevertheless be irrevocable: the interference with the life of the two communities has been too deep not to leave permanent effects on each of them and in every sphere.

•

•

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Consequences

The first and immediate result of the German measures against the Jews, the suppression of their spiritual and economic influence has already been achieved by preventing Jewish scholars and artists from continuing their work, by dismissing Jewish judges, officials and notaries, by closing lawyers' offices, by boycotting doctors and by the steadily increasing confiscation of Jewish enterprises. It remains to be considered whether this situation will be permanent and unalterable.

As it frequently happens that too severe masters produce effects contrary to those aimed at, so that radicals are often produced by schools of religious thought and reactionaries by liberal schools, it is theoretically conceivable that, as a result of a future change in German mentality, the devil will be recognised as a phantom and the Jews as what they actually are, namely, a community indispensable to Germany's greatness, with weaknesses and good qualities among which the greatest was their enthusiastic love of Germany. But when the National-Socialist wave disappears they will have become too small a group to become a serious object of hatred or love. The destruction of the German Jews is taking place finally and irrevocably.

Not only will emigration bring about their end, although their number so far has been reduced by approximately 200,000, that is to say, by a third, and will rapidly be reduced still further in the next few years. Of greater importance is the cessation for decades of the immigration of foreign Jews because just as little as the governments before National-Socialism; no future German government will be able to favour it, and the Eastern Jews, as much

from a sense of honour as because of the anything but hopeful economic situation in Germany, are unlikely to choose that country for their home in the future. Without such an influx of Eastern Jews the German Jews would have died out in a relatively short time, even without the Revolution. No community in the world had such a high proportion of old men and kept so strictly to the system of two, one and no children. The reasons for this lay in their increasing transformation into a city population and their greater demands on life, which made it a moral duty for Jewish parents to limit their offspring in view of the less favourable chances of the future generation amidst hostile surroundings. Hence according to Trebitsch 18 $\frac{3}{4}$ % of the Germans but 25% of the German Jews were over fifty years old; under fifteen, on the other hand, there were less than 18% as against 25.7% of the Germans, 41% of the Russians, and even 22% of the French.

According to M. Marcuse, already in the three years from 1906 to 1909 there were only 2.5 children born of every pure Jewish marriage as compared with twice that number (5.2) born of every Catholic marriage. The low number of children was all the more important as in 1920, according to Teilhaber, 25% of Jewish males did not marry at all. According to him, 100 Jewish women of 45 averaged only 125 children, "whereas for the preservation of the species 2.4% children from every woman were necessary". Already in 1908, when this development was not proceeding so rapidly, the number of live births were 17.37 per 1,000 Jews, according to Ruppín, in contrast to the average for the Reich, which was approximately double (34.22). For Prussia the *Jewish Lexicon* gives the German Jewish births in the year 1877 as 11,323 as against 9,880 deaths. In 1900 as 7,057 as against 5,868 deaths. In the post-War years, on the other hand, deaths exceeded births in a steadily increasing number, so that in 1922 the 5,728 births could no longer balance the 5,949 deaths and six years later the births were only 60% of the deaths (3,771 as against 5,704). Similarly, births in Bavaria between 1881 and 1927 declined by 65%, from 1530 to 471, deaths, however, only by 17%, from 953 to 763, so

that here also there was a similar deficit of 40%. In Greater Berlin, where in 1925 more than a quarter of the German Jews lived, many more Jews died than were born there, according to the figures of Teilhaber and Philippthal, and it must further be noted that many Jews who were baptised in the course of their lives are included in the birth figures, but do not appear in the figures of the deaths of those belonging to the Jewish confession. As baptisms which, according to the figures of De la Rois (certainly too low because not including Jewish children baptised at birth) had amounted to 22,000 in the nineteenth century, that is, 4% of the present Jewish population, increased still further during the twentieth century the German Jewish community was partly dying out, partly in dissolution. In spite of the immigration of 75,000 Eastern Jews the number of Jews living in Germany fell between 1900 and 1925 by 22,000 from 586,000 to 564,000. A permanent interruption of immigration or its voluntary cessation would reduce the number of Jews, in consequence of the excessive proportion of aged members and the steady decline in the birth rate, to between 200,000 and 250,000 within at most two generations, possibly to even less, as every human group melts more rapidly the nearer it approaches its complete disappearance.

The racial religion feared, it is true, a dangerous contamination of German blood in consequence of mixed marriages and sexual intercourse between both communities, which the Nuremberg laws aimed at preventing. Their practical significance however is fantastically exaggerated both by their supporters and their opponents as a defence against the future biological influence of the Jews on the German nation is concerned. For the number of children from German Jewish mixed marriages is unusually small, much smaller even than the already small number from pure Jewish marriages. Thus, according to M. Marcuse's investigations on the fertility of the Protestant-Jewish mixed marriages in the years 1906 to 1909, there was only one child on the average for every marriage, that is to say, less than half of the children of Jewish and a fifth of the average of Catholic marriages. Ruppin found in 1905 that the half of Jewish Protestant marriages and

almost two-fifths of the Jewish Catholic mixed marriages in Breslau were childless, a result which Günther, the leader of the German racial ethnologists, broadly confirms because, according to him, 35% of the German Jewish mixed marriages in Prussia remained childless and the average for these marriages is only 1.7 children. The German racial theoreticians account for this relative sterility by the difference of kind between German and Jewish blood, other authors by the fact that mixed marriages, as a rule, are only contracted in the big towns, in which there is a general tendency to birth control, and in particular in the bourgeoisie and the intellectual proletariat which are relatively barren. But whatever the causes of this undeniable phenomenon may be, it is clear that there was absolutely no danger of "deracialisation" for the German people. About 1,100 mixed marriages a year having been contracted in Germany since 1922, in fifty years 90,000 hybrids taking the highest figures or 65,000 taking lower estimates would have issued from them and, adding the usually greatly exaggerated figure of a third for illegitimate children a total birth rate of 1,600 to 2,000 hybrids a year results—that is, $1\frac{1}{2}$ per thousand of the German births amounting to 1,182,000 for 1928, and for the next fifty years together $1\frac{1}{4}$ per thousand of the present German population—and that only if against all probability the number of Jews did not further diminish.

But to judge by its results this intermixture, however insignificant from the standpoint of a millennial legislation, would seem so far to have been rather an advantage than a disadvantage to Germany. Sombart maintains, without having studied the question more closely, that the children of these marriages are "often extremely beautiful and highly gifted but morally and intellectually unbalanced". Actually racial intermixture, which has only taken place to any extent for a few generations, does not appear to be such a bad thing, since it has produced in Germany alone three Nobel Prizewinners, the chemist Baeyer, the biologist Warburg and the poet Paul Heyse, and in addition the painters Marées and Kokoschka, the poets Hofmannsthal and Spielhagen, the historians Ludo Hartmann and Duncker, the philosophers Simmel

and Scheler, the physicists Heinrich and Gustav Hertz and—as the list of dismissals from the German Universities show—numerous other scholars. In other countries it has produced, to mention only men of genius, Montaigne, Anatole France, Marcel Proust, Dumas the younger, Jaroslav Vrchlicky, the Nobel Prizewinners Niels Bohr and Elias Metschnikoff, and finally (according to Marcuse) Alfred Nobel himself.

As Teilhaber prophesied in 1911, the German Jewish community would automatically have disappeared a few decades later and in the more agreeable form of old age and restricted births, even without the brutal measures of modern Germany. The violence of the German anti-Jewish measures is only exceeded by their superfluity. As the cohesion of the German Jews was steadily giving way to a more marked disintegration and as they had become, both as a group and as individuals, racially tired and often weary of life, their intellectual economic and physical influence would have come to an end about 1960, two hundred years after it had begun.

Hence it is not the mere fact of this long-foreseen end which is so poignant, but the manner in which it is taking place. Whether Jewry be regarded as a nation, as a race, as a religion, or as a community bound by tradition and education, never in its history have its spiritual leaders perished so miserably. Even the Spanish expulsion did not put the emigrants in such a hopeless situation. It is true that they also, like the German Jews at present, could only save a small fraction of their property, but at that time, when the economic dogma did not prevail that immigrants increased unemployment—whereas they probably reduce it just as much by the introduction of new forms of production and the creation of possibilities of employment—a number of States such as Holland, England, Turkey and the Vatican States received them willingly. To-day there is no country which is prepared to grant permits to work to a large number of destitute immigrants so that many of them, preferring certain destruction at home to an uncertain fate abroad, returned to Germany where they were immediately arrested at the frontier and await their sentence in “re-education”

camp. Not a few men of talent like Tucholsky or Alsberg—formerly Helfferich's defending counsel and the counsel for the prosecution in the Erzberger trial—took their own lives in despair, while others, robbed of their identification papers and without a possibility of legal residence anywhere in Europe, have no place where they may stay and not time in which to rest. Even the Nansen passports are denied them so that grotesquely tragic situations result, such as that of the emigrant who, deported from Czecho-Slovakia to Poland and again from Poland to Czecho-Slovakia, had to spend three nights in the middle of a frontier bridge. The majority are forced to remain in Germany, especially the poor and helpless, living in a more bitter spiritual humiliation than at the time of the ghetto, at the mercy of a nation intoxicated with the ideas of race and in daily expectation of the catastrophe which will put an end to their precarious existence, since the campaign against the Jewish spirit is changing into a war of physical extermination in order to divert attention from the increasing inner difficulties of National-Socialism.

The fate of the German Jews and their neighbours, the Central European Jews, in spite of the numerous victims and the intellectual devastation which it involves, represents a series of moving individual tragedies rather than an unexpected social catastrophe. Nevertheless the form of their disappearance, although the German Jews constitute only $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ and, even together with the Central European Jews, less than 10% of all the Jews, will have historical consequences, the significance of which has so far not been recognised and whose origin lies in the complete change of attitude of the Eastern Jews with regard to Germany, which the National-Socialist Revolution has favoured and hastened.

The Eastern Jews, who represent always the largest section of Jewry and whose numbers amount to 9 or 10 millions (11 or 12 millions, if the American Jews be included) present none of the features characteristic of the German Jews: growing proportion of aged people, restricted families, high standard of living and emancipation from tradition. During the same period, that is, between 1900 and 1930, whereas the number of German Jews diminished

in spite of considerable immigration, the total number of Jews, according to reliable sources such as the *Jewish Lexicon*, increased by about 50%, rising from 10½ to 16 millions. Most of them live in the greatest poverty in Eastern Europe, so that, characteristically enough, of 400,000 Jewish immigrants to the United States between 1915 and 1927 60% had absolutely no money, according to the statistics of Traube, and a further 20% had less than 50 dollars, as compared with only 25% without money amongst the German Jews and 50% even amongst the South Italian, Rumanian, Ruthenian and Slovakian immigrants, who are regarded as particularly poor. Further, in contrast to their brethren in Central Europe, they were nearly all practising Jews clinging fast to their old traditions. But, in spite of all the differences of social conditions and intellectual outlook, a similarity of mentality existed between the two groups in so far as, until about thirty years ago, they were all enthusiastic supporters of the German nation and German culture, in spite of the contempt shown them by the Germans, and even until the beginning of the German racial movement this was true of the majority. According to Birnbaum's somewhat exaggerated estimate (he considers all Ashkenazim Jews as Yiddish-speaking) in 1929 12 million Jews used Yiddish, a German dialect, as the language of everyday life; according to the somewhat low estimate of Ruppin, in 1925 8¼ million spoke Yiddish, so that together with the German and Central European Jews, four-fifths of the whole of Jewry tended towards Germany even from the purely linguistic standpoint. This attachment of the Eastern Jews, however, was not limited to a knowledge of the language, but included, with often childlike naïveté the whole of German culture: no Rabbi of standing whose library did not include the works of Goethe and Schiller as well as the Bible and the Talmud; no philosopher for whom Kant and Hegel were not next in importance to Maimonides. Not Paris or London, still less Moscow or Warsaw, but study at a German university was the aim of the best intellects amongst the Eastern Jews whose incredible poverty and equally incredible thirst for work could be observed in all German and German Swiss University towns until well

into the twentieth century. Already before the War, the University of Czernowitz, the furthest outpost of German scholarship, would not have been able to exist without them: in 1910, out of a total of 673 students 280 or 44% were Jews. German organisation and technique, above all, German science, impressed all Eastern Jews so much that they considered the contempt with which they were treated by the Germans as a joke. Ludendorff's proclamation on his entry into the city in 1915, beginning "To my beloved Yidds in Paul", was perhaps not taken quite seriously by him, but it certainly was by them. The German poet, Maximilian Dauthendey, has described in his book, *The Spirit of my Father*, what an honour Jews in St. Petersburg considered it to relieve the isolation of his father as a German and to help his advancement in Russia. The description is typical for the attitude of the Eastern Jew towards everything German. German culture was identical with European civilisation for this community of some 10 million souls.

A tendency towards a revision of this view was, however, already to be noticed, even before the victory of the German racial idea, in the movement towards Zionism, in the lesser known movement of Yiddishism and in the increase of emigration to America. Zionism in its present form, founded by German and Austrian Jews, was originally under German leadership: after the death of Theodor Herzl, David Wolffson of Cologne and Otto Warburg were his successors and, at the beginning of the practical work for Palestine in 1903, two of the three members of the Zionist Palestine Commission were German Jews (Franz Oppenheimer and Otto Warburg), the first programme of Zionism was drawn up by Max Nordau and the Palestine Office was for many years under the direction of another German, Ruppin. As the tenth Zionist Congress transferred the headquarters of the Zionist executive, consisting of three German and two Polish Jews, to Berlin, it was above all German Jews who, until 1914, carried on the reconstruction of Palestine, and in spite of their Zionist leanings they were all friendly to German culture. Only when, at the outbreak of the War, Palestine came within the British sphere of interest, were the

headquarters of the executive moved to London in 1920. Already then there was only one German amongst their five members and in 1929 amongst the thirteen members elected by the 16th Zionist Congress there were only two Germans and not one from German Austria in which the new Zionist idea had originated. Hence, long before the National-Socialist Revolution in Germany, problems of British Imperialism and not as formerly the cultural ideas received from Germany, decided the tactics of the most important spiritual movement of the Jews even as regards current details.

German, and to a lesser extent the German Yiddish dialect, has clearly been losing its significance as the mother-tongue of most Jews since the beginning of the century. The percentage of Jews who gave German as their mother-tongue fell within the Jewish community between 1900 and 1925 by a third, from 10.8% to 6.7%, while at the same time the numbers of those using Yiddish fell by 10%. The cause of this did not lie so much in the increased popularity of neo-Hebrew, propagated by Zionism, which was restricted in the main to Palestine—in Poland in 1930, out of 180 national Jewish newspapers and periodicals 153 used Yiddish and only 18 Hebrew—as in the fact that a part of the Eastern Jews began to abandon their age-long resistance to the language of their Slav hosts: a quarter of the Jews in Poland at the census of 1921 gave Polish as their mother-tongue and only $\frac{3}{4}$ Yiddish, and in the former districts of European Russia where they had settled the percentage fell from 98% (1897) to 90% in White Russia, to 76% in the Ukraine and 48% in Central Russia in 1926—figures which do not perhaps reflect the actual situation, as political considerations may have played a part. The influence of German was further weakened by the powerful movement of Yiddishism, which undertook to transform Yiddish from a German dialect into an independent language like Dutch. Yiddish can now boast of important writers (Morris, Rosenfeld, Anski, Schalom Asch, Scholem Aleichem, Peretz, David Pinski) and in the dramatic sphere was not without influence on other cultures, thanks chiefly to Alexander Granovski. The Eastern Jews are in the process of becoming a

unified nation not so much through Zionism as through Yiddishism.

Finally the most complete cessation of the immigration of Eastern Jews into Germany and their emigration in large numbers to the United States even before the War, began to shift the centre of gravity of the Jewish community. Between 1899 and 1930, that is, within a generation, the number of Jews in America increased from 1 to $4\frac{1}{2}$ million and their proportion of the total Jewish community from 10% at the beginning of the century to 27% in 1930, so that, including the 300,000 English Jews, 170,000 Canadian Jews, 65,000 South African Jews, 30,000 Australian Jews and 350,000 Palestine Jews under British influence, a third of all the Jews are at present living in the Anglo-American world. The financial resources of the various groups have changed even more radically: 70% of the contributions to the Zionist fund, amounting to $4\frac{1}{2}$ million pounds sterling, between 1921 and 1930, were derived from Anglo-American countries and only 6% from Germany and Austria. The 65,000 South African Jews alone contributed 50% more than the 750,000 ruined German and Austrian Jews.

But in spite of this movement of Eastern Jews into the Anglo-American areas, in spite of Yiddishism and Zionism, these trends would have required decades to eliminate German influence in view of the conservatism of the Eastern Jews. Even the American Jews, including those long settled there, still preserved their inherited love of Germans until shortly before the victory of National-Socialism. Since the War a very considerable part of the German state, municipal and industrial loans, to an amount of several thousand million marks, was placed in America by their banks (Kuhn-Loeb, Warburg, Hallgarten, Seligmann) and with the help of the propaganda of the said banks, for which they were later blamed. Culturally also they displayed their sympathy, for shortly after the War the president of the Metropolitan Opera in New York, Otto H. Kahn, had the courage to arrange German productions of German operas. The relations of the Yiddish-American and Polish Jews with Germany were even closer: admiration for

German organisation and faith in its economic and political recovery remained for them unshaken, just as the German merchant, industrialist and scholar were still his ideal. As far as immigration to France took place, they were considered there as Germans. Even Balzac a hundred years earlier had described the same phenomenon of the striking love of the Jews for the Germans.

Only National-Socialism succeeded in doing what was not even achieved by the persecutions of the Middle Ages which had forced many German Jews to flee and settle in Poland without causing them to abandon their German language and culture, namely, to destroy at one blow their devotion to German culture, science and commerce. This change of attitude took place not so much because the Eastern Jews were despised by the Germans as an inferior race, nor from a feeling of solidarity with the German Jews, who, they felt, had long since withdrawn from the Jewish community, as because a Germany of mysticism, a Germany which despised intellect and reason, which controlled economy and science, was no longer that Germany to which they were attached from the bottom of their heart. This estrangement therefore has taken place with startling rapidity within the last few years. Every young Jew in Poland, Lithuania, Russia and Rumania now uses the national language in his business transactions, Yiddish in conversation as an independent language which consciously separates him from German, and learns neo-Hebrew as the language of his future. Many middle-aged members of the community still know High German, but no longer proudly make use of their knowledge as they did formerly, and their numbers decrease year by year. German is becoming a foreign language and even as such is being displaced to an ever-increasing extent by English, which is used by millions of the relatives of the Eastern Jews living overseas. Emigration to the United States "acquired more and more the character of an immigration of relatives the greater the number of Jews became there". Between 1900 and 1925 61%, according to other figures actually 86%, of all Jewish immigrants to the United States received their passages from American relatives. For the Polish and Russian Jews, therefore, America has become the commer-

cial and industrial idol instead of Germany, so much so that Polish Jews do not reckon in marks but many only in dollars, and the enthusiasm of the Russian Bolsheviks for American industrial methods is due to a large extent to the Russian Jewish intelligentsia.

Within the Jewish community as a whole, a phenomenon may be noted which has regularly recurred during the last 2,000 years, namely, that at any given period that section was always considered the most advanced which had most freely submitted to the influence of the high culture of the environment and had been most active in furthering it. That is why a Babylonian, Alexandrian, Arabian, Spanish, Dutch and German period may clearly be distinguished in Jewish history, whereas the relatively numerous Polish Jews were the leaders of the Jewish community in religion but not culturally, as they rejected the Slav culture of their environment as below their own. *The German period of Jewry has now come to an end, the Anglo-American period has begun.* Now that 5½ million Jews are active within the Anglo-American sphere and a further 8½ million in Eastern Europe see in it the promised land, the Jews are deliberately, though under compulsion, leaving the German sphere of culture and entering into that of the Anglo-American.

Two of the immediate consequences of this important event, namely, the economic boycott and the de-Germanisation of German areas outside the Reich, have been frequently discussed, and their importance greatly exaggerated by National-Socialists and Jews alike. They are, however, of a definitely temporary and not of a fundamental nature. An economic boycott can only be undertaken by a well-organised community controlling great material resources and even then not always with certainty of success, as the Continental blockade of Napoleon shows. The Jews, split up into numerous parties, scattered throughout many countries on whose administration they have no direct influence, are least of all in a position to realise a unified economic plan. No state will place the resources of its economy at the disposal of a Jewish boycott. Such a boycott is rendered more difficult by the various methods of

concealing the origin of goods. The transference of the wealth of German refugees abroad also operates against it, so that even Palestine imports every year commodities to the value of 2 million pounds sterling (11% of its total imports). Many drugs and many necessary machines are practically a German monopoly. The cheapness of the articles, in consequence of German dumping, frequently exceeds the spirit of self-sacrifice of the single individuals. Consequently, with the exception of the United States in which a part of the international trade is in Jewish hands, the Jewish economic boycott is more a wishful dream than a reality. If America be left out of consideration, the damage, which cannot be established statistically, done to German trade by this movement—a movement based chiefly on sentiment and quite disorganised—can only amount to a very small percentage. In view of the economic situation of Germany, this may be unpleasant, but not a permanent or vital disadvantage.

The same is true of the de-Germanisation of many national areas endangered by Jews acquiring other nationalities or joining the movement to create a nation of their own. It is true that within a relatively short time some important Rumanian towns will lose their German character in consequence of the enforced change in Jewish mentality (thus Czernowitz with 45,000 Jews out of 110,000 inhabitants, Grosswardein with 18,000 Jews out of 82,000, Klausenburg with 11,000 out of 98,000). But in the Polish frontier areas under dispute the Jews are much too weak to influence the national decision by their rejection of German culture. In Posen they constitute only the half of 1%, in Polish Silesia only 1½%, in Danzig and in Memel only 2% of the total population and in the German Bohemian linguistic areas less than a tenth of the German minority.

But if the economic boycott and the endangering of some German linguistic islands outside the Reich are only trifling episodes in the history of the great German nation, the withdrawal of all Eastern Jews from the sphere of German culture is, on the other hand, an event of historical importance. It means the permanent and irrevocable loss of the economic hegemony which the

Germans have until now exercised in the whole of Eastern Europe.

Numerically a loss of from 8 to 10 million Eastern Jews, whose education in their "schools" until a short time ago consisted in translating their religious texts from the original Hebrew into German, may not play any decisive role for Germany with its European population of 82 million, although it nevertheless amounts to the loss of about five Alsace-Lorraines. But these eight million had been, since the Middle Ages, and in spite of all the temptations of their Slav surroundings into which they refused to be dissolved, the most faithful supporters and the strongest centres of German economy, culture and intelligence in Eastern Europe. In Poland their numbers are three times as great as those of the Germans, their former allies, living there. In Russia more than twice, in Lithuania and Latvia, one and a half times, and in Yugoslavia they still constitute an eighth of the German minority. Their proportion of the population of the most important towns of all the East European States is much greater. In the big Polish towns, such as Warsaw, Lodz, Cracow, Lemberg and Vilna, they constitute from a quarter to a third of the population; in Rumania, only 7%, it is true, of the population of Bucharest, but almost half the population of Jassy, Kischinew and Czernowitz; in Russia, in Odessa, Kiev, Minsk, Cherson and many other towns from a quarter to a half of the population, even in Tiflis almost a tenth, and in Moscow, where the enormous increase of the population has reduced their percentage, more than 130,000 Jews are still living. Their influence on national and international trade extends far beyond their number. In 1921 more than 300,000 Jews were engaged in commerce and banking in Poland but less than 200,000 non-Jews. In Soviet Russia, they provide one-eighth of all engaged in these branches—six times their percentage of the population—in Rumania, a quarter. The trade of these nations with Eastern Europe largely depends on the Jews, their knowledge of the languages, their business connections, and, other conditions of competition being equal, on their sympathetic understanding of the business methods and the spirit of the Eastern nations.

As almost all Eastern Jews use Yiddish, which until a few years ago they considered a German dialect and for the most part also knew High German, in which they could make themselves understood, the German merchant or industrialist before the German racial movement was never a stranger when he travelled on business to the East. For this reason German had in Eastern Europe, from St. Petersburg to Tiflis, from Lodz to Moscow, Kiev and Odessa, from Warsaw to Jassy and Sarajevo, wherever a Jewish population was engaged in trade and acted as intermediary, the same significance as English has for the world. The deep respect for German punctuality, order and power of organisation, and above all for German culture, represented for the Eastern Jew by every real German, gave the latter a privileged place which would have made the Eastern European countries under normal conditions once more an economic domain of Germany, because the preference of their leading commercial class for the Germans could not be counterbalanced by English, French and American competitors, no matter how efficient they were.

This preference for everything German, deriving from traditional respect, is now finally at an end. The Eastern Jew, whenever he has to choose between German or Anglo-American business relations, decides for the latter without a moment's hesitation, not in order to support the Jewish boycott against Germany, but because the mystic irrationality of the new German spirit, the blending of business and dictatorship which is becoming more and more prevalent amongst German industrialists and business men, makes every permanent relationship alarming and impossible. He begins to realise that he is considered as the supreme enemy of the German faith, so that, as time goes on, his original love and later his wondering indifference at the German development, is being transformed into the permanent hate of a life-and-death struggle for bare existence. For National-Socialism regards industry and commerce no longer as a means of peaceful economic penetration, but as auxiliary military services, with the help of which land for the German peasants has to be conquered in the east by the German sword. Eastern Jewry, the trader as the oppo-

ment of the German hero, must therefore be destroyed in order that the German nation be led back by force of arms to the life of the peasant, to "blood and soil" as Hitler proclaims in his programme. If Germany had not abandoned its commercial and industrial mentality in favour of this National-Socialist agrarian dream, Bolshevism, theoretically anti-capitalist, in practice engaged in large-scale colonising and fascinated by technical progress, would have admired Germany as much as it idolises America to-day. The Russian Jews also, even as Bolsheviks, would have continued in their traditional respect for German methods, German economy and German civilisation if the latter had not fundamentally altered their direction and their aim. At a time when Germany is hankering after the subjugation of Eastern Europe to provide a basis for its future position as a world power, it loses the economic hegemony of which it could never have been deprived for the sake of a dream which forces its most faithful allies to become its deadly enemies.

For the characteristic National-Socialist over-estimation and under-estimation of the Jews shows itself on a magnified scale and raised to the level of a symbol in the part which it allots to the Jew as the antagonist in the heroic drama of the German drive to the East. The *leit motif* of German religion, world history as a conflict of the productive Germanic hero and the barren Jewish trader, reappears here in the form that the Jew is the sovereign ruler of Eastern Europe at the present time and his defeat is the essential condition of German world domination. Hitler proclaims this ultimate aim of German foreign policy, the subjugation by force of the East after the destruction of Jewish power, in a passage of his book which he himself has emphasised as decisive: "When fate handed over Russia to Bolshevism it deprived the Russian people of that intelligentsia which till then had brought about and guaranteed its existence as a nation. . . . For centuries Russia has been nourished by the Germanic core of its ruling classes. That core can now be regarded as almost completely exterminated and destroyed. Just as it is impossible for the Russians to shake off by themselves the yoke of the Jews, so it is equally impossible for the Jews permanently

to retain that mighty empire. . . . The gigantic empire in the East is ripe for collapse and the end of the domination of the Jews will also be the end of Russia as a State. That is why the eternal drift of the Germans to the South and the West must be stopped and their gaze turned towards the countries of the East. The mission of the National-Socialist movement lies in the ceaseless work of the German plough for which the German sword has to provide the soil. German development must once more begin where it stopped six hundred years ago—with the military colonisation of Russia."

This cardinal aim of the foreign policy of the National-Socialists—which in contrast to many others, is also accepted by the real rulers of Germany, the German General Staff and the Prussian Junkers, and furnishes the real reason for the fortification of the Rhineland and the discussions on the divisibility or indivisibility of European peace—cannot possibly be realised because all the assumptions on which it is based are unreal: the Jew was never the ruler of Russia and the German of our day has no desire to Germanise Russia by settling there as a peasant bound to the soil. Although the Jewish intelligentsia as one of the most oppressed classes under Czarism played an important part in the Russian Revolution, the new Russia was organised by Lenin and is ruled, not by Trotsky but by Stalin, and the Jewish community there—robbed of its essential principle of cohesion, its religious tradition, by the anti-religious policy of Bolshevism—is fighting a losing struggle against disintegration. The Germans, on the other hand, who in the six hundred years between 1300 and 1900 have changed from a peasant people to a nation of townspeople, do not suffer from any greater shortage of land than 130 years ago. Their peasantry, which is no more numerous than in 1800, possesses the same land as at that time and is by no means willing to give up German cultivated land in favour of the Russian steppes. They feel no longing for the East, but are drawn rather towards the West; the frontier provinces of Posnania and West Prussia are by far the most thinly populated in Prussia, and between 1910 and 1925 more than 135,000 Germans left East Prussia, the density of whose population is

likewise less than half of the average for the Reich for more westerly regions. Still less has the town population any desire to give up the advantages of a town life for the sake of colonising Russia. The younger generations in the towns, including the National-Socialists, dislike the life in the East so much that at the moment 175 state positions as country doctors are vacant in East Prussia and since 1933 the number of deaths steadily increases there. It will never be possible, no matter what means of compulsion are employed, to reverse the development of the last century and force the Germans to adopt a peasant life in Russia and to strive for its Germanisation. The drive to the East only exists in the minds of the National-Socialist leaders.

The empty phantasies of the longing of the German people for "blood and soil", of the opposition between trader and hero and of the necessity for conquering European Russia may lead in spite of the impossibility of realising them to a disastrous war, given the capacity of the Germans for following their leaders through victory and defeat to death and destruction. Even a military success gained by Germany against Poland or Russia would result in nothing but an increase of its heroic glory and a catastrophic deterioration of its material situation. The German Empire under Wilhelm, despite its overwhelming superiority, failed to denationalise the tiny Polish frontier areas of Germany, because the Germans themselves refused to settle there and Polish labourers had to be employed to cultivate the great Prussian estates. Similarly, a victorious Germany could not send to Russia even a fraction of its population, two-thirds of which are townsfolk. Undoubtedly the call of the leader to destroy the Eastern countries under the control of the Jews by a merry heroic campaign would be followed. But there is a big difference between carrying on a war for a few months or years with heroic enthusiasm and spending one's life without any heroic glory far from accustomed civilisation in the solitude of the Russian steppes. The German industrialist and business man of the Germany before the War was on the point of creating a German sphere of economic influence in Eastern Europe with the help of the Eastern Jews. The

German sword may perhaps conquer Russia but will never colonise it.

The foreign political programme of National-Socialism draws its strength as propaganda from the fiction that Russia is a Jewish state and its destruction therefore a stage in the historical struggle between the Germanic peasantry and the Jewish traders. From the same source springs the second consequence of anti-Semitism for Germany which exceeds in importance even the loss of economic predominance in the East and the danger of a disastrous even if successful war. It involves Germany in the suicidal attempt at a withdrawal from the community of European nations in every sphere of life and culture.

The importance of anti-Semitism, which has existed in all countries and at all times, must not be over-estimated. By preventing recognition of the fact that the Jews fulfil everywhere unhonoured but indispensable functions, it inevitably leads to a restriction of the development of the nation, which however is of a temporary nature as long as it does not affect spiritual foundations. In Germany the situation is quite different. Here anti-Semitism, as the core of the new German faith, has taken over the definite function of identifying the Jews with the ideas and the mentality of German Germany in the fight which is not yet quite decided between it and Prussian Germany. National-Socialism draws from anti-Semitism the emotional energy required to combat as anti-German everything that unites Germany with Europe. Here the Jews play in foreign policy not so much a real as a symbolic role. As a war against concrete figures inflames passion much more than one against general intellectual tendencies, the ideas hated by National-Socialism and on which Europe is founded—ideas which it is the fame of a bygone Germany to have helped to realise—are personified in the figure of the Jew. He is the anti-Wotan of German faith. Thomas Mann has formulated this personification of European anti-Prussian ideas by identifying them with the Jews in his characteristically thoughtful and detached manner: "The hatred of the Germans, or of the German rulers for the Jews, considered on the intellectual plane, is not directed against the Jews or against

them alone: it is directed against Europe and against all that is highest in German culture; it is directed, as becomes clearer from day to day, against the classical Christian foundations of Western morality; it is an attempt to shake off the bonds of civilisation (well symbolised by its withdrawal from the League of Nations) which threatens to cause a dreadful division, and one pregnant with disaster, between the land of Goethe and the rest of the world."

It is true that the basic ideas of European culture, the ethical teachings of Christianity, the impartiality of science, the freedom of art, the high esteem of individuality, justice as a supra-national ideal and the antithesis to egoistic force, are realised nowhere in Europe. The power of Christianity neither prevented the War nor suppressed the misery of the post-War period, people are often considered only in the mass and as individuals suffer all the horrors of injustice and arbitrary power. The sciences are passing through a period of crisis, art seems everywhere to have lost its free creative power, even apart from State intervention. But the resignation which as a result has come upon so many Europeans is not due to the death of these immortal ideas, but arises from a comparison of the inadequate reality with the longed-for ideal. Whoever is in despair at unemployment and its consequences, indignant at corruption and injustice, shaken in his faith in reason by the doubts of the scientists and the restrictions imposed on individual and artistic liberty, obviously proclaims the validity of these ideas and mourns only their impotence, which he invariably exaggerates, comparing it with the power which they should have. For in reality the basic ideas of Europe are neither dead nor without influence. The various forms of State assistance for the weak, social insurance and unemployment benefit, are insufficient: but it is a consequence of Christian ethics that they exist at all and that they are felt as inadequate. Socialism, however anti-religious it claims to be, is based on Christian belief and has its origin in the sympathy with the poor and the helpless, in the conviction expressed in the Sermon on the Mount that the children of *one* Father should have a just share in the spiritual and material goods of the world, that every

workman is worthy of his hire and that everyone, because he is a human being, has a right to live and a claim on the help of others. Even Marxism, which combats the injustice of robbing the worker of the surplus value produced by his labour, is based on the assumption of the necessary protection of the weak and hence on an ethical assumption which is self-evident only to Christian feeling. And who, without denying the value of reason, can deny that European technique and the improvement in the conditions of living during the nineteenth century, which have made the world not happier but healthier and longer-lived, are based on the achievements of a science which, though not starting entirely without assumptions, must continually submit these assumptions to the freest criticism? The freedom of the individual, the freedom of art, when they degenerate into unbridled licence, must at times be restrained, because a balance must continually be sought between the rigidity of social forces and the anarchy of the internal forces. But they can never disappear in Europe as the living ideal of a truly human life until Europe herself has been destroyed.

Europe at present doubts whether the European principles can be realised, but it does not question their justice. It fears the victory of chaotic force if these ideas should perish—indeed it already wrongly regards this victory as complete because of their temporary retreat before the successes of German power policy—but it will never accept racial mania as ethics, force as justice, lack of liberty in art as its true essence, and recognise blood as victor over reason. Present-day Germany denies these ideas themselves. It does not believe in Christian charity and the love of one's neighbour, but in the laughing brutality of the old Teutons, not in liberty but in compulsion, not in art but in propaganda, not in justice, but in the egotistic advancement of one's own community, not in the individual and his capacity for being educated but in the predestination of the race. Everywhere it attempts to convince those who resist these ideas by maintaining that all the ideas attacked are part of the Jewish strait-jacket which was imposed, by what infernal power is unknown, upon the healthy instincts of the German people, who must now be released from it.

The appeal to the passions of would-be liberating anti-Semitism dispenses with the necessity of arguments. What need is there for a discussion of the works of Bernard Shaw, Galsworthy, Mark Twain, D'Annunzio, Jens Peter Jacobsen or Tolstoi, when their being Jews or being influenced by Judaism is sufficient grounds for their rejection—as actually happens in the 28th and 34th editions of the *Handbook on the Jewish Question*, this German book of homilies for the home? The Aryan Hindemith can be dismissed as infected with the bacteria of Jewish decay and his persecution can thus be justified by Goebbels. This is, of course, easier than trying to understand atonal music, which contradicts both the childlike ideas of the cultural leaders of Germany on the naïveté of all art and the fictions of the Germanising tradition—but which in reality continues the revolutionary line of development of German music in the nineteenth century. The absurd idea of a “German Physics” was conceived because the modern atomic and relativity theories, as a continuation of the rational intellectual processes on which European and American science has been built up, run counter to German faith; but it could only be realised because the doctrines combated are those of the Jews, Niels Bohr and Einstein, and as such only fit for destruction. And even the flippant definition, “Whatever serves the German nation is right”, which identifies the naked egoism of a community with the conception of justice, was first put into practice against Jewish scholars. Only after the success of the application of this new principle of justice, accompanied as it was by the approving or embarrassed silence of the great majority of Germans, did it acquire the power to sentence to 1½ years’ penal servitude Catholic priests also, because of their having criticised Rosenberg’s book; to execute workers, in spite of the validity of earlier judicial decisions, for alleged participation in the slaying of Horst Wessel; or to take into preventive custody inoffensive citizens like the director of the Reichsbank, Köppen, for having filed a just claim for rent against a National-Socialist who simply refused to pay; in short, that terrifying confusion in all spheres of law in which force appears as the principle of justice and justice as a Jewish invention. Even the vehemence with

which the breach of the Locarno Pact, voluntarily entered into by Germany for its own protection, was justified in terms of the principle that whatever serves the German nation is just, has its ultimate psychological origin in the view that what is sauce for the Jews must likewise be sauce for France and Belgium. For the nations resemble vessels communicating with each other: if justice sinks in one, it falls to the same extent in all others. Germany would never have proclaimed might as right in its foreign policy if European diplomacy had recognised the menace of this formula when it first appeared and had taken as energetic measures against it as Bismarck did against the refusal of equality to the Rumanian Jews.

Even should it not come to a new World War, the German belief in force nourished by anti-Semitism, is bound to cause in Europe a temporary neglect of cultural aims and methods for the sake of rearmament, as it can only drive out the devil of war by the Beelzebub of armaments. For Germany this belief in force means more than that: it is the weapon with which the German nation will destroy its own existence. For the ideas which it combats as anti-German are just those on which Germany's expansion was founded and without which it can certainly die a heroic death but never lead a prosperous life. The conception of a constitutional state, Christian ethics, humanistic education, the liberty of science and art were re-stated and elaborated in Germany during the nineteenth century and made it at times the model country of order, of social welfare, of productive personalities, creative music and unprecedented scientific successes. The idea of a constitutional state, the protection of civic liberties and the obligation of all authorities to submit to stable laws were philosophically formulated by Kant, adopted by German statesmen, even those with absolutist tendencies, and practically applied in German courts and in the administration, to create, by means of a just, if at times narrow and hard interpretation of the law, that admirable order and organisation to which Germany owed its incredible economic expansion before the war. Similarly the spirit of Protestant Christianity in the nineteenth century was also a living German force, not, as

the handbook for officials in the National-Socialist state teaches, as apostasy depriving Germans of their Germanic inheritance. Consciously acting in the spirit of this Protestantism, Bismarck created out of nothing, without any literary and scientific preparation, the original German system of national insurance to save the health and the purchasing power of millions, and thus translated the Christian principle of helping the weak—an example for all Europe—into a German deed. Equally German was the fearless and unbiassed criticism which gave German philosophy since Kant the lead in Europe. The rejection of all national, patriotic or religious dogmas was an essential condition of every scientific achievement. The exact discrimination between faith and knowledge, which appears to the present leaders an anti-German thought, laid the foundations for German technology and enabled Germany in spite of Versailles to continue as a spiritual and economic world power. The characteristic features of German art, expressed above all in music, were not revealed in the submission to the ruling political ideas which is to-day considered German, but in their independence of the sentiments of the time, in their expression of the eternal, in the revolutionary efforts of Beethoven, Mozart and Schubert to express the universally human by means of the national, the immortal by means of the transitory. Even Wagner, who, ultra-radical and ultra-reactionary at the same time, represents not the beginning but the beginning of the end of the great era in German music, still lives not because of his attempt to revive the Germanic corpses, not on account of the family history of the Volsungs, nor of his spectral alliterative verse, but because of his passion for the revolutionary freedom of art, his creative transformation of musical forms and Isolde's *Liebestod* as the victory of human feeling over social convention.

These German ideas which, at the end of the eighteenth century, after almost two centuries of spiritual, material and political misery, awoke Germany to a new life, were destroyed by the National-Socialists, and in doing so they destroyed not only the German Jews, but, under the pretext of combating them, Germany itself. The destruction of a constitutional state in favour of a Byzantine

eneration of arbitrary dictatorship may not be dangerous to other countries which have never known a Constitution, such as a part of Eastern Europe or Asia: for Germany it is fatal. Already after three short years, characteristic and terrifying symptoms of the approaching chaos are to be seen in the abstention of all Germans from recourse to the civil courts—as their decisions like those of the Supreme court are dictated by a spirit of the most abject submission to the prevailing political ideas—and in the distress of German lawyers, with an average income fixed by law of 3,000 marks (formerly the salary of their typists) to whom the expropriation of their Jewish colleagues has brought no great prosperity, but only the proof that in a state without law lawyers are superfluous. For laws are the mechanism of justice, whereas connections are that of a dictatorship. What function can be exercised by lawyers and courts in a State which daily breaks signed agreements, not in an emergency, but as a principle of law, according to the political situation, and in which private individuals, as even the National-Socialist press laments, no longer fulfil their contracts, make payments in bonds on a distant future and tax-credits instead of in cash, and justify their economic selfishness by an appeal to the welfare of society advocated by their National-Socialist protectors? No economy could tolerate this without damage. German economy, built up more than any other on the protection of formal and material honesty, will undoubtedly be destroyed by it.

The decline of the second great idea of the nineteenth century, the liberty of science, will inevitably have the same consequence, as many indications already show. Even the National-Socialist Minister of Education, Rust, in order to avoid the immediate destruction of the German Universities, has had to depart from the methods employed at the beginning of appointing National-Socialists as professors, on the strength of worthless books on the achievements of Nordic genius, instead of the German and Jewish scholars who had been expelled. He overcomes the difficulty by leaving the posts vacant. In Cologne at the present time (1935) there are twelve Chairs vacant, in Königsberg nineteen. A new

generation of scientific workers is lacking in all fields because it is psychologically impossible to unite the spirit of critical research with reverence for unproven dogmas. If one can persuade German scientists and professors to discuss confidentially the quality of their students one is surprised at the rapidity with which the results of a century of development have been destroyed, root and branch. German science, which created German technology and with it the superiority of German armament, can now only boast isolated representatives and in ten years will have ceased to exist. The German pedagogues who at the Philological Congress in Trier in 1935 were agreed that they "expected from science not truth but sharpened swords" overlook the fact that a science without liberty, without knowledge as its aim and a thirst for truth, will be incapable of producing even the perfect swords they desire. A German chemistry which, from loyalty to the German creed, leaves untested non-German fruitful hypotheses, will not be able to provide Germany in the event of a new war with new inventions like the nitrogen process and poison gas of the Jew Haber; a German physics will be unable to produce improved aeroplanes, because Nationalist mysticism, though sufficient for a hero's death, is not able to create the means for the death of others. In the hour of danger even Odin's ravens will not be able to inspire with knowledge and intelligence the students who finish at the German Leaders' Schools—in which, according to the decree issued by Ley, nationally minded, healthy and racially immaculate youths are to be enrolled without consideration of their intellectual abilities and acquirements. In view of the disappearance of its intellectual and economic foundations, German technique will shortly find itself in the same position as the Prussian army ten years after the death of Frederick the Great: Europe considered it invincible when it had long become a mere ghost. Remembering the Bismarck empire which, through its application of the intellectual forces taken over from the past to military purposes, was unique and irresistible, the same Europe fears the Third Reich too much. Reason, which it rejects and identifies with Judaism, is no longer disciplined there, so that all the mistakes of the past World War will be repeated in a future one.

raised to a higher power. For it is impossible to demand blind obedience from the German people, from soldiers and officers, and then, at a decisive moment, the power of free decision, without which the next crucial battle is bound to be lost, like that on the Marne. The destructive science and technology of war will not remain at its old level after the prohibition of free research. The decline of German science and with it the cessation of technical development leads necessarily not only to the intellectual but also to the military inferiority of Germany.

Another new German dogma which likewise draws its power from anti-Semitism has already made Germany in peace time a fortress blockading itself. The fiction of the heroic Nordic bound to the soil in contrast to the cunning international Jew without a home underlies Germany's entire commercial policy, so that a mouthpiece of German national economy, Professor Gottl-Ottlienfeld of Berlin University, in full agreement with the political leaders, proclaims autarchy as "the vital and necessary attitude of national economy towards international trade". Yet Germany's foreign trade in 1929 was only a third smaller than that of Great Britain, in spite of the enormous colonial empire of the latter; it was a third greater than that of France, three times as great as that of Italy or Japan, and in 1930 only a fifth lower than that of the United States. Germany, whose average imports and exports in the years 1927 to 1929 amounted to 14 thousand million gold marks, held third place as regards volume of its foreign trade amongst all the nations of the world. The same Germany, for whose existence international trade is more indispensable than for most other countries, is systematically destroying it and thereby weakening its town population, that is, two-thirds of the nation, by sacrifices for the sake of the principle of racial autarchy—behind which, it is true, is concealed the very real desire of the Prussian Junkers to save their estates by means of high inland prices of cereals at the expense in the reduction of the standard of living of the towns. Just as the German propaganda minister in one and the same speech declared he would do everything to further the export of German films, and to reduce the import of foreign films,

the German economic policy in every field attempts to present economic laws such as supply and demand, payment of debts as an essential condition of credit, buying in return for selling, as intrigues of Jewish capitalism against the racial ideal of heroes. The various symptoms of this race-destroying racial policy are terrifying—the increase of public debt from 12 to 50 thousand million marks within three and a half years, the decline in the purchasing power of wages, the flourishing of luxury industries as in all inflation periods, the falling of the consumption of meat by a quarter, the doubling of the amount of champagne drunk, the reduction in the social welfare services, the laborious maintenance of industrial export by State subventions running to thousands of millions, the collapse of the shipping companies of Lloyd and Hapag, which had already been reorganised three times. But even more alarming is the conscious negation of economic reason as an anti-German trait, the unshakable conviction that race is a substitute for all rational considerations, that a world export industry can exist in spite of autarchy, strength and joy in spite of declining real wages and increased taxation, cunning Nordic credit swindles side by side with new credit demands and free commercial initiative together with blind subordination. Destroying the basis of its former greatness Germany lives according to the suicidal belief which the economic editor of the *Völkischer Beobachter* formulated as a programme: "We National-Socialists do not believe in economic laws, but in the creative genius of our race because we feel stirring within us the dynamic will to create. To say that the mission of National-Socialism is to draw from the creative genius of our race the order corresponding to its instincts, is to assert that National-Socialism has planted its flag on the highest summit of our century. Because we believe in the creative genius of our race, economy is subject to our creative will."

Escherich, a German investigator of the ants, gives an account of a species of particularly militant ants, whose jaws are shaped like sabres and which are only warriors and not workers, which neither build nor collect food but maintain slaves of other species, on whom they completely depend for nourishment. If by accident

or design they kill their slaves, they die in the midst of an environment of plenty and, curiously enough, not because their organs of nourishment are atrophied, but because their instincts for collecting and distributing food have deteriorated with the development of their warlike abilities. The German Jews, whom the Germans made use of in the unpleasant and for them difficult branches of trade and finance, have frequently proved failures, as is shown by the scandals connected with the Austrian Creditanstalt, the Darmstadter Bank and the Phoenix Insurance Co. But, despite their extent, they are only trifling episodes compared with the economic catastrophe which is preparing now that the national heroes in Germany have taken over German finances, and which will far surpass even the horrors of the inflation brought about by Stinnes. For such a prophecy we do not need German statistics, which, biassed in the national interest, have become a doubtful weapon of inland policy instead of the model for all countries that they were. But it is an *a priori* truth that a nation educated in the exclusive admiration of a warlike mentality and in a contempt of the commerce which nourishes it, but which needs commerce like bread and for its bread, cannot get rid of the Jewish traders, financiers and agents who looked after its food supply, indifferently enough perhaps, but at all events did do so, if it has lost the instinct of doing so itself as a result of cultivating warlike abilities. Heroes cannot transact business if their instincts have been developed along the lines that business and bravery, commerce and war, blood and gold, heroes and dealers, are irreconcilable contradictions. Frederick the Great and Bismarck, who were the first to impress this unreal antithesis on the German nation knew very well why they made use of the Jews in the financial preparations before or after a war, as they did not believe that it was possible to develop at one and the same time in the Germans military and business abilities. The German leaders to-day, who are transforming Germany to a still greater extent into an army of heroes, who need trade but despise it, who must carry it on but cannot do so, are moving through glory and misery towards a victorious suicide of the German nation.

Suicidal victory, victorious death—this is the aim which the German nation seems to be pursuing consciously and ecstatically in all fields under the influence of National-Socialism. Germans rage wildly against Germans in the concentration camps, resort to barbaric methods of legal procedure and legal punishment, sterilise 85,000 of their own countrymen every year (not as an exceptional measure but as a social institution), give their children as Christmas toys models of bombers and poison gas laboratories, defame a great part of their own nobility as Jewish in a pseudo-Gotha, and in a pseudo-Kürschner their most famous philosophers and artists, honour the blue-eyed philosopher Mathilda Ludendorff because of her accusation that Goethe was an accomplice in the murder of Schiller by the Freemasons, and abuse in a paroxysm of self-destruction the greatest preservers of their nation, Virchow, Koch and Behring, as the scum of humanity. All this in order to bring about the domination of race by the levelling of everything outstanding, to assure Germany's future by destroying German tradition, and by crushing all intellectual resistance to hasten the sublime moment of glorious death. For it is not the happiness of life which is to be the fruit of victory, not the hope of being able afterwards to enjoy love, art and science, the products of machinery and the goods of civilisation. The love of man for woman serves but the breeding of the race, motherhood the training of heroes for the field of battle, art the glory of war, science and technology the production of its weapons, philosophy its justification. They are all no longer aims of life, but means for the day of victorious destruction on which the night of long knives and rolling heads shall follow throughout Europe. Blood and death is the constantly recurring refrain of all the deeds and speeches of the present representatives of the German nation. Here for the last time anti-Semitism becomes a symbol, a symbol of the hatred of life. The Jew, instinct with vitality despite all persecutions, loves to live and let live, the German of our day to die and let die. What so infuriated all Nationalist Germans was that the Jews during the War, even the most nationalistic, and especially those, desired its end without a victor's peace and the danger of catastrophe, and after the War did not wish to

repeat it for the sake of a suicidal glory. For whoever kept his head enough to judge sanely the balance of forces was always in Germany an enemy of the people, and whoever did not approve as the final aim of a nation a glorious and heroic death was a hated sub-man.

Actually the German Jewish scholars and intellectuals, who for that very reason were continually persecuted, did in fact accept the function which National-Socialism accords them, and which consists in keeping alive humanism, the freedom of art, the truth of science—these eternal ideas which National-Socialism hates—and handing them on in the form in which they received them from the great Germans of the eighteenth century. Just as their ancestors formerly gave to Europe the Bible, the foundation of Western morality, they preserve to-day in exile the former German doctrine of the supremacy of reason, feeble and flickering it is true, but the only light amidst the darkness of this world. In Germany to-day the leaders and a great part of the nation reverence as supreme values irrational instincts and, possessed of a mysterious impulse of self-destruction, are about to exchange, as so often in German history, the short period of dazzling splendour of the Second Empire for a long period of profound misery.

Otto Bangert, a leading author of National-Socialism, concludes the first of the poems of the German Revolution, which form the appendix to his book, *Gold or Blood*, with the words:

“Over a nation of the dead
The fires of eternal glory rise.
Let us end like the Goths.”

What a strange aim for a revolution, what a strange desire for a community to wish to disappear like a tribe of which only the name remains! And what an idea for a leader to desire to end on a nation of the dead!

What Clemenceau said of the Germans now becomes truth. They love death, not life, their instinct for destruction, released first

